K. M. PRABHAKARA VARIAR

STUDIES IN MALAYALAM GRAMMAR

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

1979

STUDIES IN MALAYALAM GRAMMAR

K. M. PRABHAKARA VARIAR

STUDIES IN MALAYALAM GRAMMAR

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

1979

University of Madras Malayalam Series: 21.

STUDIES IN MALAYALAM GRAMMAR

by K. M. PRABHAKARA VARIAR

First Published: March, 1979

Price Rs. 20/-

© UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

Printed at the Rathnam Press, 41, Badrian Street, Madras-600 001.

FOREWORD

This work attempts to re-examine certain grammatical notions pertaining to Malayalam language, that have already been codified in the vernacular grammars, in the light of recent advancements in the study of language. Those, who are not familiar with the basic concepts and methodologies of modern linguistics, might find certain portions a little hard to comprehend. The author, however, has taken care not to stuff the text with more linguistic terms than are absolutely essential.

The discriminating reader could easily detect the author's differential treatment of a particular grammatical concept in the majority of the topics that form the present text. Almost seven of the eleven sections directly or indirectly deal with case-grammar. Case in grammar, subsuming both the semantic relationships and the corresponding surface manifestations, pervades almost all spheres of language. A proper understanding of the case system of language leaves very few areas of grammar for further exploration. This is being offered, not as an

apology for the author's bias, but only as an explanation of what follows in the book. The rest of the sections concern with general topics, one being a critical evaluation of the phonological theories as expounded in important Malayalam grammars, another a reappraisal of Malayalam nominal attributes and still another an analysis of the copulative sentences in Malayalam, and lastly, an attempt to throw some light on a sparsely dealt paralinguistic phenomenon.

Some of the sections in the text are revised versions of papers, already published in research publications and periodicals. The author does not claim that there is one single thread running through the pages of this volume except the rather loose unity of enquiries in the major part of the work to which reference has been made above. In a collection of apparently diverse topics like this, certain instances of minor repetitious statements are bound to show up. It is believed that such occurrences do not adversely affect the coherence of the work.

My thanks go to the authorities of the University of Madras for not only accepting this work for publication but also for providing me with the congenial atmosphere to do my work without which I wouldn't have been able to bring out this in the form as it stands now. I look forward to receiving valuable suggestions and constructive criticisms from scholars.

It is hoped that the present work will be useful to students of higher learning in the field of Malayalam Linguistics.

K. M. PRABHAKARA VARIAR.

CONTENTS

Foreword, v

Scheme of Transliteration, ix

one : Phonological Theories in Malayalam Grammars, 1

two : Nominal Attributes, 19

three : The Copula, 37

four : Post-Positions, 53

five : The Expression of 'Direction', 63

six : The Expression of 'Path', 69

seven : Vocative and Genitive, 77

eight : Li:la:tilakam on Case, 83

nine : A Unique Phrasal Construction, 93

ten : Subjectless Sentences, 105

eleven : Vocal Segregates, 121

Bibliography, 129

Glossary of Technical Terms, 137

Author Index, 151

Subject Index, 153

SCHEME OF TRANSLITERATION

VOWELS

a	—	Central low (unrounded)	:	അ
i	—	Front high (unrounded)	:	ഇ
u	—	Back high (rounded)	:	ഉ
r̥	—	(Sanskrit vocalic sound)	:	ഋ
e	—	Front mid (unrounded)	:	എ
o	—	Back mid (rounded)	:	ഒ
ə	—	Central mid (unrounded)	:	(സംവൃത ഉകാരം)
:	—	(vowel length)		

CONSONANTS

STOPS :

t	—	dental	:	ത
ṯ (ṟṟ)	—	alveolar	:	റ്റ
ṭ	—	retroflex	:	ട

NASALS :

ṅ	—	velar	:	ങ
ñ	—	palatal	:	ഞ
ṇ	—	retroflex	:	ണ
ṉ	—	alveolar	:	(ന)
n	—	dental	:	(ന)
m	—	bilabial	:	മ

SIBILANTS :

s	—	dental	:	സ
ṣ	—	retroflex	:	ഷ
ś	—	palatal	:	ശ

LATERAL :

l	— alveolar	:	ല
ḷ	— retroflex	:	ള
l̤	— retroflex continuant	:	ഴ

TRILL :

ṟ	—	:	ര

ASPIRATION :

(with 'h')

(The rest of the symbols are employed as in common use).

one

Phonological Theories in Malayalam Grammars

0. Introduction

In this chapter we propose to examine the phonological observations presented in some of the important Malayalam grammars and to evaluate them in the light of the advancement that has taken place in the field of phonology in general, and phonology of Malayalam in particular. We have, as a prelude to the main body of the survey, included a section, on the important Malayalam grammars. A brief reference to the conventions of terminology adopted by them follows next. The third section deals with the Malayalam system of Alphabet. In the next section the physiology of speech sounds is taken up for consideration and finally the variations of speech sounds have been examined.

1. Malayalam Grammars

Broadly speaking, Malayalam grammars can be classified into two groups, those written by native scholars and those written by foreigners. Differences are bound to exist in the approaches of native people who write grammars of the language they use every day, and those of foreigners who attempt to analyse an alien language. We can see more theoritical discussions in the first than the latter. Native scholars show more competence in dealing with the historical aspects of their language. On the other hand, grammars written by foreigners are rich in copious citations.

The earliest work on Malayalam language, viz. *li : la : tilakam* (14th century) does not purport to be a comprehensive grammar of the Malayalam language. Its professed goal is to codify the characteristics of *maṇiprava : ḷa* style. Besides the rudiments of the grammar of *maṇiprava : ḷa* language, the work also deals with literary stylistics, figures of speech, and other essentials of rhetoric.

The next important grammatical treatise written by a native scholar is Rev. George Matthan's *malaya : ḷamayuṭe vya : karaṇam* (first published in 1863). Matthan had not seen Gundert's grammar while he was working on his own. The main difference in these two grammars, as Matthan himself has noted in the preface to his grammar, is that Gundert's grammar, although rich in the copiousness of its quotations from earlier works, in support of the rules formulated therein, is dogmatical in its approach while Matthan's grammar is relatively more explanatory in nature. Credit should go to Matthan for incorporating theoritical discussions about various aspects of grammar into his work. It is a pity that this work has never enjoyed the reputation, which it legitimately deserves, the main reason being the appearance of a monumental grammar about three decades later by Prof. A. R. Rajaraja Varma.

Rajaraja Varma's *ke : raḷapa : ṇini : yam* is undoubtedly the most popular and widely used Malayalam grammar. It first made its appearance in 1896 followed by a completely revised version

in 1917. *ke:raḷapa':ṇini:yam,* by its clarity of expositions, the logicality of its arguments in support of the rules presented therein, and, above all, the pleasant style of its language, has eclipsed all other Malayalam grammars making it the most sought-after text for using in educational institutions. Rajaraja Varma, in the preface to his grammar, makes it very clear that his grammar was written taking into consideration the historical developments of the Malayalam language. In fact, he claims that diachronic approach is more useful than synchronic descriptions.

M. Seshagiri Prabhu's grammar, *vya:karaṇamitram,* which first appeared in 1904, is another work that has succeeded in gaining some popularity among the traditional linguistic works, primarily due to its having been prescribed as a text-book. Prabhu's *vya:karaṇamitram* excels both Matthan's and Rajaraja Varma's grammars in size only. He has incorporated several unnecessary discussions into his treatise vainly creating an illusion of grandeur to his grammar. One, who takes up this grammar to know something about the language which it is concerned with, would surely wonder why frequent digressions are made in the work to problems relating exclusively to Sanskrit language.

Another native grammar that has created some stir among linguistic scholars is T. M. Kovunni Nedungadi's *ke:raḷakoumudi.* Although the manuscript copy of this work was completed in 1875, it got published only in 1878. It is to be noted that this grammar is never referred to by any one in discussions of pure grammar. However, the work is often quoted in connection with its disputable (?) view on the origin of Malayalam language.

A series of Malayalam grammars written by foreign scholars appeared during the course of nineteenth century (Drummond, 1799; Spring, 1839; Peet, 1841; Arbuthnot, 1864; Gundert 1868; Frohnmeyer, 1889 etc.). Among these only Gundert's and Frohnmeyer's grammars attained some degree of prominence. The credit for producing the first complete grammar of Malayalam language goes to Gundert. A major defect of this grammar is that many of his examples which are taken from earlier literary works, have become obsolete in contemporary Malayalam and as

such the rules given to account for such forms have no relevancy from a synchronic point of view. Neverthless, it is to be emphatically admitted that the numerous citations from earlier texts found in this work serve as extremely valuable materials for tracing the historical development of the language of the west coast. His achievement in producing a grammar of the vernacular, of such exhaustiveness as this, is remarkable, and later grammarians including the most eminent of them, A. R. Rajaraja Varma, have expressed their indebtedness to him.

'A Progressive grammar of the Malayalam language for Europeans' by Frohnmeyer is, strictly speaking, a learning guide rather than a grammar. The author, in writing this grammar, had before his mind 'the practical needs and the natural process of mastering a language' and the twenty and odd lessons in his work amply substantiate the above claim.

2. Terminology

Technical terms in Malayalam grammars, with few exceptions, are borrowings from Sanskrit. In modern Malayalam it would be extremely difficult to coin a scientific term purely based on native roots. As L. V. Ramaswami Aiyyar once remarked, Malayalam language, which did not at any time put up resistance against the infiltrations of Sanskrit, "suffered an irreparable loss in that it lost its power of forming fresh compounds to express new ideas and consequently had in later times to draw freely upon Sanskrit vocabulary to make up their deficiency" (Ramaswami Aiyyar, 1925: 5). There were sporadic attempts, now and then, for nativizing the scientific terminologies but they did not bring any results. Before the appearance of *ke:raḷapa:ṇiṉi:yam* the grammatical terms prevailing in Malayalam were not standardized. Each author, accepting many of the existing terms, introduced some new terms also. The acceptance of *ke:raḷapa:ṇiṉi:yam* as the authoritative grammar for pedagogical purposes gave wide currency to the terms used in that work. *li:la:tilakam*, as it was written in Sanskrit itself, wouldn't have faced any difficulties in the matter of terminology. But both Gundert and Matthan,

for whom there were no models to lean upon, the problem would have been extremely difficult to tackle. The editor of Gundert's grammar states: "......by far the greatest part of the Malayalam terms (are taken) from the Sanskrit grammarian Panini and his school. Some expressions have been borrowed from the Tamil *nannu:l* and a few terms were coined under the force of circumstances" (Gundert, 1962: 12). Matthan chiefly relies on Sanskrit for the terms in his grammar. Many of the terms used in Matthan's grammar are not found elsewhere.

3. Alphabet

The inventory of basic sounds of Malayalam given in various grammars lacks uniformity. According to Gundert, there are 12 vowels and 37 consonants in Malayalam. He excludes the Sanskrit vocalic sounds ṛ and ḷ, the *visarga* and *anusva:ra* which usually find their places in the complete list of Malayalam alphabets. The 37 consonants include the 25 *varga* letters, 7 medials, 4 sibilants, the alveolar n̲, and the trill r̲.

Introducing the then—existing alphabetical list, Matthan finds the system imperfect and proposes certain modifications. His list includes 10 vowels and 38 consonants. To Gundert's consonantal list he adds the alveolar stop t̲ also. Matthan deliberately changes the order of vowels from a, i, u, e, o to a, e, i, o, u arguing that "*e* and *o* are placed before *i* and *u* because they (*e* and *o*) are close to *a*, which is the basic sound" (Matthan, 1969: 31). The reason given by him is not entirely convincing but his modification, no doubt, attempts to give some order to the disorderly manner by which vowels used to be listed. Matthan's patterning results in an ascending order of front vowels followed by an ascending order of back vowels. Recognizing the importance of ə in Malayalam, he, not only accords the phonemic status to it, but also demands its representation by a special symbol. The special symbol for this vowel came into force only very late in the Malayalam writing system.

Both Seshagiri Prabhu and Rajaraja Varma have expanded the above lists by retaining some sounds which their predecessors

have discarded. Prabhu has thus 55 basic letters and Varma 53 (Seshagiri Prabhu, 1922: 41 and Rajaraja Varma, 1974: 93).

It is quite disconcerting that Malayalam grammars do not show agreement even in the matter of the alphabetical system of the language. In a recent persuasive paper, this problem has been examined in a fairly exhaustive manner (Sukumaran, 1974). Sukumaran's suggested list contains 54 letters altogether. His proposal is well augumented by the phonological facts of the language which he describes at length. It should be admitted that even now the question has not been settled in academic circles.

4. Physiology of Speech Sounds

Articulatory phonetics is sparsely described in traditional grammars. Either, they make no reference to it or, treat the subject in a fragmentary manner. This negligence can be ascribed to the fact that traditional grammars were primarily intended to be analysises of the written language wherein matters regarding actual pronunciation are insignificant. Even if the spoken language is to be described, one cannot say anything definitely because pronunciations differ from one dialect to other, and ultimately from one person to another. As such, a complete and accurate phonetic analysis of the language of a speech community is an unattainable ideal.

Li:la:tilakam, being limited in its scope does not make any reference to the physiological aspect of Malayalam speech. Gundert and Nedungadi have, for reasons unknown, brushed aside this topic. While Matthan touches upon the physiology of Malayalam speech-sounds very briefly, there are fairly exhaustive treatments of the subject in the grammars of Rajaraja Varma and Seshagiri Prabhu. In the ensuing paragraphs, the views of these three authors are examined.

In the section on Origin of letters (Matthan, 1969: 36–40) Matthan briefly discusses the articulation of Malayalam sounds. From the modern point of view, these descriptions are far from

accurate. In the description of vowel production, there are clear indications that the tongue-position, tongue-height, and lip-rounding have been taken as the basis for distinguishing one segment from another. He gives a strange account for the articulation of *a*—"The sound *a* is the easiest to pronounce and is the basis for all other sounds. That is why it is placed in the beginning of the alphabet in almost all languages. It is produced just by opening the mouth and releasing the air through glottis. It has more affinity to the gutteral sounds and *h* rather than to the rest of consonants" (*ibid*: 36). In dealing with the articulation of consonants, he gives only a very general picture. The oral-nasal and the obstruent-spirant distinctions are clearly recognized but the lateral and trill articulations are not differentiated. Appropriate positions have been assigned to various consonant-groups. A major omission here is that the voiceless and voiced articulations are not distinguished, especially in regard to non-obstruents.

Rajaraja Varma deals with the articulatory mechanisms under six processes which account for the distinct characteristics of basic Malayalam sounds (Rajaraja Varma, 1974: 97–101). The processes are: (1) the manner of breath-release, (2) the manner of tongue movement, (3) simultaneous articulation, (4) the path difference in the omission of breath, (5) positions of contact, and (6) the duration of articulation. The first process divides the speech sounds as non-contact (vowels), slight-contact (medials), half-contact (sibilants), and contact (stops and nasals). The voiceless and voiced distinction is accounted for by the second process. Aspiration is explained as a case of simultaneous articulation, the third process. Aspiration as per this account, is the result of an *h*—sound mixing with other stops. In vowels, e, o, ai and au are also claimed to be results of double articulation as follows: a+i=e; a+u=o; a+e=ai; a+o=au. The oral and nasal releases are described under the fourth process. The fifth process distinguishes the sounds according to their positions. Long and short vowels are differentiated on the basis of the sixth process. After the above classification Rajaraja Varma has made some specific observations regarding the phonetic qualities of certain

sounds like the trill *ṟ*, the flap *r*, the unique Dravidian sound *ḻ*, the alveolar stop and nasal, etc.

Seshagiri Prabhu has treated the articulatory features of Malayalam sounds more elaborately than others. He initially distinguishes two types of processes: 'internal' and 'external'. Broadly, these two refer to positions of articulation and manners of release respectively. The internal process includes contact, slight-contact, opening and closing. Stops are produced by contact-process and medials by slight-contact. The opening and closing mechanisms divide the sounds as 'open' and 'close'. Prabhu speaks about eleven external processes, the explanations for which are unclear. Three of these processes are stated to be relevant only for the pronunciation of the vowels in Vedic hymns. The others seem to be accounting for voicing, aspiration, nasal release, fricativization, etc.

It could be seen from the summaries presented above that both Varma and Prabhu have given sufficient importance to the treatment of phonetics in their grammars. Generally speaking, Rajaraja Varma has given a fairly satisfactory picture of the articulatory phonetics. But some of his observations are untenable from the modern point view. His four-fold division in the manner of breath release as non-contact, half-contact, slight-contact, and contact does not seem to be congruent with facts. Again, he seems to be unsure about the exact phonetic quality of Malayalam *h* as he has assigned both the voiceless and voiced qualities to this sound. This has become necessary because aspiration is stated to be the result of a stop articulation mixing with a *h*—articulation and because both voiceless and voiced aspirated stops occur in the language. In explaining the nasal release, the author appears to be suggesting that nasal sounds will always be voiced which is not fully correct. The assignment of vowels to various positions of articulation is done on a purely arbitrary basis. Further, his statement, that long vowels are uniformally elongated varieties of their respective short forms, is not in consonance with the findings of modern acoustic phoneticians. A discrepancy which cannot be taken lightly is his statement that the tongue is the

instrument which facilitates the opening and closure of glottis. In Prabhu's analysis we get a fairly accurate description of the physiology of the vocal apparatus which is not found in any other Malayalam grammar. Prabhu has even given a diagram of the articulatory organs. The major defect of his treatment of phonetics is lack of clarity. Inconsistencies show up here and there in his analysis.

This section will be incomplete unless we make a brief reference to the grammar written by Frohnmeyer. His approach to the phonetics of the language is pedagogic and therefore, assumes only a secondary importance for our purpose. Yet, some of his remarks are capable of arousing curiosity. For instance, Frohnmeyer, while giving the correspondence between Malayalam and English sounds, has equated the Malayalam voiceless stops to English voiced stops. He has also stated that the initial *k* of Tamil and Malayalam differ in their phonetic qualities. What prompted him to say that the Malayalam voiceless stops are closer to English voiced counter-parts rather than the voiceless is not very clear. Was it because that in the pronunciation of initial plosives, a kind of laxness was perceived among some Malayalam speakers? He could correctly recognize the alveolar and trill qualities of the *ṟ* in Malayalam, but has resigned himself to say that the sound is undescribable probably because that the sound has no exact equivalent in European languages. Frohnmeyer's observations are not to be taken so seriously as to be considered scientific. Neverthless, they show how certain pronunciations of Malayalam sounds are heard by a foreigner and to what directions the fluctuations of pronunciations were moving.

5. Sound Variations

5.0. Traditional grammarians, as they were not familiar with the concept of 'phoneme' and their 'distributions', described the distributional characteristics of phones as variations of sounds. In what follows, we propose to examine some of their observations on soundvariations occurring in Malayalam. The first paragraph of every following section will be a summary of the particular

views on the problem, and in the following paragraph we will give our comments on the same.

(For this section, we will be using the following abbreviations: G—Gundert, 1962; M—Matthan, 1969; R—Rajaraja Varma, 1974; S—Seshagiri Prabhu, 1922; F—Frohnmeyer, 1913. Other titles will be referred to as usual).

5.1. Stops in the intervocalic position.

Malayalam plosives are pronounced as voiced stops when they appear between vowels (G: 31; S: 58; F: 7). This is the well-known Caldwellian law of the convertibility of surds and sonants (Caldwell, 1956: 138). M and R do not refer to this variation. For G, the intervocalic pronunciations of plosives are 'like sonants'. F presents a more cautious comment in that 'they almost sound like their corresponding sonants'.

The intervocalic plosives of Malayalam neither become 'voiced' as the grammarians suspected, nor change into voiceless fricatives as a latter Dravidiologist (Ramaswami Aiyyar, 1925: 11) contended. Our observation is that between vowels the single plosives acquire 'slight' voicing and 'slight' friction only. Furthermore, the fricativization does not occur in the affricate *c* and the retroflex *ṭ*.

5.2. 'a' becoming 'e'.

The environments for this change are as follows according to the grammars indicated within brackets:

(i) after sonants and word-final y and r (G: 27);

(ii) after word-initial sonants, y, r, l and kṣ and before word-final n, r, l and ḷ in non-monosyllabic words (M: 40);

(iii) after sonants and medials (R: 108 and S: 54);

(iv) "If an, ar, al, aḷ close a word, the letter *a* is slurred over like *a* in the criminal" (F: 4) and "the short *a* contained in ga, ja, ḍa, da, ya, ra in the first syllable of a word as well as the *a* in the

final syllable *an* are not always a full *a* but often something like *e*" (F: 8).

From the above, it is clear that all grammarians agree to the *a*>*e* change before sonants. F has not included *b* in his list but that seems to be an omission. It is only M who gives a correct picture in this regard. He has mentioned that even the dipthong *ai* becomes *ei* after sonants. Ex: *dainyata*>*deinyata*. There is no change of *a*>*e* after *v*. Even R and S could not give examples for such a change. Both G and F disregards *l* where actually such a change occurs as seen from examples given by M, R and S. It is again surprising that only M has noted this change after initial *kṣ*. Ex: *kṣama*>*kṣema* 'patience', *kṣaṇikkuka*>*kṣeṇikkuka* 'to invite'. G, M and F mention the change taking place before word-final n, r, l and ḷ (for G, only the first two and for M, only in polysyllabic words). The present writer feels that the *a*>*e* change in these positions may be sporadic or occurring only in certain dialects.

5.3. i>e and u>o before 'a'.

In this case too, Malayalam grammarians differ in their interpretations. According to G, the changes occur before *ṭ*, *l*, *ṟ*, *ḷ*, *l*, etc. (G: 28–29). M's restriction is that the alterations do not occur before geminated consonants and consonant clusters, and gives the following examples in support: *tiṭṭam* 'certain', *uṣṇam* 'heat' (M: 41). Both R and S do not refer to the presence of *a* in the following syllable as a condition for the alterations to take place. S, in addition, states that the changes occur only before *ṭ*, *ṇ*, *r*, *l*, *ṟ* and *ḷ* (R: 111–112; S: 55). F makes a brief reference to this interchange in the following words: "with reference to the vowel *e*, bear in mind, that it is often exchanged for the initial vowel *i*" (F: 8). Again, "in colloquial language *u* in the first syllable of a word in general is pronounced like *o*......" (F: 9).

In south Dravidian languages, this interchange of vowels is a regular differentiating feature. When a short *a* follows, the initial syllable of a great number of words are found to be *i* and *u* in

Tamil and Malayalam. Correspondingly, in the said environment, *e* and *o* are found in Telugu and Kannada. This problem of interchange of vowels has been extensively discussed by eminent comparativists from a broader perspective. Here, we are not directly concerned with the course of investigations carried out by them as their purpose was different. This vowel alteration takes place within Tamil and Malayalam between the written and spoken forms. From the observation of Malayalam grammarians, it appears that mainly two points are worth scrutinizing. Firstly, is it true that in Malayalam these variations are restricted to a small set of phonological environments as stated by G and S? Secondly, does the presence of following geminated consonants and consonant clusters block such variations as claimed by M? According to G and S, the variations occur only before cerebrals and liquids, but there exist number of words in Malayalam which contradict their view. Some such words are given below:

vitaykkuka	>	vetaykkuka	'to sow'
viśappə	>	veśappə	'hunger'
puka	>	poka	'smoke'
putappə	>	potappə	'blanket'

As regards the second point, M's contention, that the operation of the rule is restricted to cases where a single consonant intervenes between *i* or *u* and the following *a*, seems to be right in a general sense although in a few rare examples the variation is found to occur before geminated consonants also (*muṭṭa*>*moṭṭa* 'egg'). We have not so far come across examples where this variation takes place before consonant clusters. This might be due to the fact that the rule does not operate in loan words, and pure Dravidian words do not normally allow consonant clusters.

5.4. The mid-central-unrounded vowel.

In all Malayalam grammars this vowel has been referred to as a variety of the rounded *u*. G calls this vowel 'half *u*' saying that it is the shortest among all vowels (G: 28). M names it as 'half vowel' and assigns to it a position between

a and *e* (M: 33–34). Both R and S group *u* and *ə* together differentiating them as 'rounded' and 'unrounded' respectively (R: 112; S: 54–55). F repeats what G has stated. M and R, however, have demonstrated how this vowel contrasts with *u* in Malayalam. Throughout R's lengthy discussion on the qualities of *ə* there is no clear indication as to whether this vowel is to be treated along with other basic vowels in Malayalam, although he considers that it is in no way shorter than other short vowels of Malayalam.

In modern Malayalam, *ə* must find its place in the inventory of phonemes. It should be, however, mentioned that this vowel has relatively limited privileges of occurrence as it appears only in word-final positions. A sound very close to *ə* does appear in word-medial positions. In writing, the round *u* can come in all positions of words but the same is pronounced as a full rounded *u* only in the initial syllables and finally. Medially, the symbol *u* has the pronunciation of a central high unrounded vowel and, therefore, both *u* and ɯ can be grouped as allophones of the same phoneme. The occurrences of ɯ are illustrated in the following words:

[tʌṇɯppə]	–/taṇuppə/	'coldness'
[mʌrɯnnə]	–/marunnə/	'medicine'
[uṛɯppə]	–/uṭuppə/	'dress'

5.5. Qualities of 'a' in Malayalam.

G, R and S assign various qualities to the vowel *a* and this peculiar situation had led to lot of confusions among native scholars. G classifies the vowel *a* of Malayalam as 'pure' and 'palatal' and states that the palatal variety corresponds to the word-final *ai* of Tamil (G: 27). S seems to have thought of two allophones of the phoneme *a*, one relatively 'closed' which appears medially, and the other relatively 'open' which appears initially, and finally (S: 54). While classifying the basic sounds of Malayalam R states that *a* has a velar articulation (R: 101). Earlier, discussing one of the processes by which Malayalam

moved away from Tamil, he assigns a 'palatal' value to *a* and states that those which are not palatals are 'pure' (*ibid*: 61). Later, palatal *a* has been equated to *a*, appearing after sonants and medials which in pronunciation becomes *e* (*ibid*: 108). Again, the word-final long *a* of Sanskrit which is changed to short *a* in Sanskrit loans in Malayalam (ex: *a:śa:*>*a:śa* 'desire') is also given the palatal quality because in sandhi the glide *y* appears after it as in *a:śaya:l*, *a:śayil*, etc. (*ibid*: 108). Not satisfied with all these fragmentary observations, he makes a sweeping generalization that all final *a* of nouns are palatals whereas the verbal roots may end either in the palatal variety of *a* or in the pure variety of the same vowel and gives the following contrasts (*ibid*: 109):

Pure		*Palatal*	
maṛakkuka	'forget'	maṛaykkuka	'hide'
kiṭakkuka	'lie down'	kiṭaykkuka	'get'

The situation is further complicated by his statement that *a* of Malayalam can also be labial but he hastens to add that the labial quality of *a* is only a variation of pronunciation and does not affect grammar (*ibid*: 110). The nightmare again catches him when the same problem has to be confronted in the chapter on sandhi. Here, the labial quality of *a* is not merely a grammatically insignificant variation of pronunciation, as assumed earlier, but a sound-feature exerting its influence on sandhi (*ibid*: 127).

Even a casual perusal of the summary of views presented above would convince any one that the grammarians' observations on the metamorphisms of the Malayalam vowel *a* are basically incorrect. To compare two sounds occurring in identical positions of cognates of two languages and to assign a feature to one of them on the basis of its correspondence in the other language, would be tantamount to distorting the real issue. Similarly, just because a particular sound acquires a different sound value in a colloquial dialect would not qualify its being considered as having more than one existence. An unitary sound is always a bundle of

distinctive features. Any alteration in the set of features would produce a different unit. Therefore, to say that a particular sound unit in a language has various conglomerations of features simultaneously is fundamentally wrong. Among the three grammarians whose views we presented above, only S seems to be indicating although not explicitly, the distributional characteristics of the Malayalam phoneme *a*. The arguments of both G and R tend to detract attention from the real issue. Notice how R has repeatedly contradicted himself in the course of his examination of the problem. R's treatment of the problem has been subjected to critical examinations in two recent papers (Antony, 1973 & Vasudeva Bhattathiri, 1974).

5.6. t>l alternation in Sanskrit loans.

In Sanskrit loans, *t* and *d*, either when they stand alone at the end of a word, or when they are followed by consonants, are pronounced as *l* in Malayalam. Ex: *matsara*>*malsaram* 'quarrel'; *adbhuta*>*albhutam* 'surprise'; *sa : kṣa : t*>*sa : kṣa : l* 'real'; etc. (G: 36; M: 41; R: 119 and S: 61).

This change has taken place probably due to a confusion created by the writing system in Malayalam. The graphemic representation of consonants in Malayalam, as we all know, is syllabic. In earlier times, separate allographs were in vogue for some consonants for which there were non-syllabic single representations. The non-syllabic consonant sign for the dental *t*, later, for reasons unknown, became the sign for the non-syllabic consonant *l*. Therefore, wherever this sign appeared in clusters, the sign was pronouced as *l*.

5.7. The dental and alveolar nasal.

Malayalam has only one symbol for both the dental and alveolar nasals although they show contrast when they are doubled in words like *enna : l* 'but', *e<u>nn</u>a : l* 'by me'. When they appear in single they are in complementation. G says that the dental *n* occurs initially and before other dental consonants while the alveolar <u>n</u>, medially, finally and before <u>r</u> (G: 34). According to

M, *n* occurs initially, before dental consonants, and after all consonants, whereas *ṉ* occurs between vowels and before non-dental consonants (M: 42). F does not seem to be considering them as two distinct sounds as he states that "besides the usual *na* given above (i.e. the dental?) this letter has another pronunciation especially in the beginning of words (?) when the tongue touches the edge of the teeth" (F: 2). R's observation is as follows: "The symbol for *ṉa* when it is single, has always a dental articulation in the beginning of words. Elsewhere it has the alveolar quality. The sign for non-syllabic *n* has always the alveolar value. In clusters *na* has the dental quality after the consonants and the alveolar quality before consonants......Yet before dental consonants it will always be dental" (R: 106). S formulates the following rule to explain the partial complementation of these two nasals: "Initially and after consonants the dental occurs, and non-initially and before consonants the alveolar appears" (S: 59).

None of the above observations reveals the exact nature of the partial complementation of the dental and alveolar nasals in Malayalam. The single dental and alveolar nasals have the following distributions:

n —initially except before y;
before dental consonants;
after all consonants except ś.

ṉ —(elsewhere)
initially before y;
between vowels;
before non-dental consonants;
after ś;
finally.

(*Note*: There may be slight variations in dialects and idiolects.)

5.8. Overlapping or *r* and *ṟ*.

For the flap and trill varities of *r*, there is only one non-syllabic primary symbol in Malayalam. Therefore, it becomes necessary to

specify the exact pronunciations of this symbol when it occurs as a non-syllabic sound alone, and also when it occurs along with another consonant. G has noted the merger of non-syllabic *r* and *ṟ*, but has not attempted to show the specific contexts where each occurs (G: 35). M states: "In clusters and in (the pronunciation of Sanskrit vocalic) *ṛ*, *r* should be pronounced as *ṟ*......But before *y*, *s* and *ś* and after sonants, *r* has its own (flap) sound......" (M: 41). According to S, "the sound *r* in clusters, except after sonants, is pronounced as *ṟ*" and "in consonantal clusters r occurs before *y*, s, *ś* and *h*; *ṟ*, elsewhere" (S: 59). R makes a brief reference to the final *r* in many instances becoming *ṟ* (R: 129).

This problem has been dealt with more explicitly from a modern point of view in Sukumaran, 1974. Sukumaran's views can be summarised as follows: *r* and *ṟ* are separate phonemes in Malayalam. But when they appear along with consonantal clusters, they are in complementation. Only *r* appears after sonants and aspirated consonants. Elsewhere, the tril variety is heard. In clusters, when it occurs as the first component, *r* occurs before *y* only; before other consonants *ṟ* only appears. If the cluster has more than two consonants (besides *r*), usually we hear *ṟ*. The secondary symbol for both *r* and *ṟ*, when they occur in clusters, is the same.

6. Conclusion

As mentioned earlier in the 'introduction', phonology has never been considered as important as the formal features of language (morphotactics) by traditional grammarians. Their belief that spoken language is substandard and always inferior to written language, might have, to a great extent, contributed to their lenient attitude towards problems concerning the phonotactics of the language. Compared to their analysis of the other aspects of the language, the phonological descriptions in Malayalam grammars, in general, cannot claim to have had many noteworthy achievements.

two

Nominal Attributes

1. Introduction

Attributes can be defined as those omissible members of a group in which there is at least one non-omissible head. Here, the omissibility test refers to the possibility of a member being deleted without changing the syntagmatic structure of a word-group (de Groot, 1956–57: 130). Attributes belong to a class of major grammatical categories, which includes a variety of sub-categories such as articles, demonstratives, adjectives, relative participles, and so on. Among these sub-categories, adjectives have been the topic of extensive analysises by traditional as well as modern linguists. In ancient times adjectives were regarded as a sub-class of verbs at one time and later, a sub-class of nouns. The process of successive differentiation of word-classes was continuing and

during the Middle Ages adjectives were granted independent status (Robins, 1970). But the issue, whether adjectives can be functionally equated to verbs or nouns did not settle down altogether. Modern linguists reopened the discussion and during the present century various views have been presented with no sign of a consensus in sight. The stative—non-stative distinction found both in verbs and adjectives and also the possibility of some adjectives appearing in the predicate position in some languages have tempted some to identify them with verbs in some respect. Likewise, semantic similarities of adjectives and nouns are taken as the basis for identifying them as belonging to the same class. Jespersen distinguishes adjectives from nouns stating that "substantives are more special than adjectives; they are applicable to fewer objects than adjectives" (Jespersen, 1968 : 75).

In the transformational approach, the adjective—noun phrase is derived from an underlying predicated source through an operation called 'adjective embedding transformation'. This particular grammatical operation turned out to be one of the most disturbing aspects of Chomsky's grammar. Serious objections were raised against this claim in later years (Winter, 1965; Bolinger, 1967; Lazarus, 1973). These objections were based on the non-specificity of tense aspects in the underlying structures. Both Bach and Lazarus have attempted to disentangle the knots in different ways. Citing the non-recoverability of the tense elements associated with the auxiliary of underlying sentence, Bach proposes to set up a hypothetical auxiliary element assigning a 'narrative' tense to it. By 'narrative' he means a tense "which takes on its value from the narrative context of the sentence in which it is embedded" (Bach, 1968: 99). Lazarus proposes to have a unique semantic feature which triggers the generation of pre-nominal adjectives: "Let us introduce into the semantic component a new inflectional feature or unit, 'synthesive', which we will assume is the deep level element ultimately responsible for the generation of a pre-nominal adjective on the surface" (Lazarus, *op. cit*: 53).

These difficulties in deriving attributive nominal phrases from deep sentential structures confirm the earlier view of adjective-noun

combination as a psychological unit. Evidence from linguistic ontogeny supports this idea (Schelsinger, 1971). Attempts to correlate linguistic structures to a net-work of language-free dependent concepts show the unitariness of attribute—noun category at the conceptual level (Schank & Tesler, 1970).

Those, who have attempted to classify the noun modifiers, resort to various methods and the resulting picture looks confusing: A major classification is 'descriptive' and 'limiting' (Curme, 1935: 42 and Bloomfield, 1956: 203). But "the boundary between limiting and descriptive adjectives is not completely definable" (Bloomfield, *op. cit*). The 'limiting' class includes 'determiners' and 'numeratives'. Determiners can further be divided into 'definite' and 'indefinite'. Curme's classification of the limiting class is more extensive. Others have included items that are morphologically derived from other word-classes in their classification (Yotsukura, 1970).

The order of pre-nominal attributes has also been the topic of serious investigation. Various claims have been made in this regard. According to Ziff, the attributes are ordered on the basis of their relative definiteness (Ziff, 1960). Vendler suggests that the more 'privileges of occurrence as a noun' that an adjective can have, the closer to the head-noun it must be ordered. Martin reports that adjectives are more closely positioned with their head-nouns in terms of their intrinsic semantic relations to the nouns. Ertel finds that, besides semantic considerations, the interchangeability of adjectives in the pre-nominal positions is controlled by a supplementary set of constraints of some sort of implicative relations between the adjectives (Vendler, Martin & Ertel as reported in Bever, 1972). Danks & Glucksberg's experimental study shows an integration of the semantic intrinsicalness rule and the pragmatic communication rule in respect to the ordering of adjectives (Danks & Glucksberg, 1971). Roose has remarked that the order is based on the inherence of quality meant, that is, 'the more inherent the quality denoted, the closer the preadjunct stands to the noun' (Roose, 1962). It could be seen from the above, that the order does not seem to be arranged

on a single scale. Languages seem to be differing in the constraints responsible for the ordering of pre-nominal attributes.

Recent trends in the semantic analysis of natural languages show the individual lexemes as composed of smaller elements. These smaller elements are the minimal content units or the semantic markers. Although sporadic attempts have been made in showing how particular lexical items can be interpreted as the conglomeration of some basic semantic primitives, the studies were not extended to the attributive class. Few investigations about the semantic structure of adjectives from a philosophical angle, however, show that the semantic structures of adjectives are not so easily decomposable as in the case of other grammatical categories. Bierwisch's analysis of the primitive elements that are required for the correct interpretation of German adjectivals shows some unique markers like (± polarity), (± verticality), (± inherent), etc. which normally do not appear as elements of the semantic structures of other form classes (Bierwisch, 1967). Fillmore characterizes some adjectives as 'relational concepts' and suggests that for the proper semantic interpretation of sentences containing relational concepts we would require some sort of 'entailment rules' (Fillmore, 1971). Givon contends that English adjectives are not semantic primitives and suggests the surface derivation of adjectivals from deep categories of nouns and verbs (Givon, 1970).

2. Adjectives in Dravidian

A controversy exists among Dravidiologists whether adjectives are to be treated as a separate form class in Dravidian languages. Andronov examines this problem referring to the views of earlier scholars and states that "doubts were expressed not only in regard to formal boundaries and morphological features of this class of words, but even in regard to its existence as a separate part of speech in general" (Andronov 1972: 167). Although classical Tamil does not distinguish adjectives grammatically, Andronov asserts: "As far as Modern Tamil is concerned the existence of the adjective is a fact" (*Ibid*: 178).

3. Views of Malayalam Grammarians

The treatments of nominal attributes of Malayalam by earlier grammarians show methodological imperfections. Frohnmeyer repeatedly points out the rarity of pure adjectives in Malayalam (Frohnmeyer, 1913: 31, 88, 160 & 224). Nevertheless, he is giving a list of items which have attributive function in Malayalam (*ibid*: 160–61). Gundert has only few roots appearing as adjectives in compounds only. Such items as *nalla* 'good', *iḷaya* 'young', *paḷaya* 'old', etc. are relative participles for him (Gundert, 1962: 69). This may be historically true (even this assumption is not based on citable sources) but these words have no other function than attribution in the present-day Malayalam and hence they should be treated as attributives only. George Matthan classifies adjectives into (1) fulfillment of necessity (2) qualificatory and (3) causal. (Matthan, 1969: 144–45). His classification obviously is not complete as Malayalam noun-attributes show many other functions. In the well-known modern grammar of Rajaraja Varma, the classification of nominal attributes shows the following types: (1) pure, (2) pro-nominal, (3) numeral, (4) descriptive, (5) meausre, and (6) relative participle. Antony examines this problem in detail and states that there are at least seventeen forms in Malayalam which are inherently adjectives. They are fourteen pure adjectives (*putiya* 'new', *paḷaya* 'old', *ceṟiya* 'small', etc.), two demonstratives (*a*: 'that', *i*: 'this') and one numeral (*oru* 'one') (Antony, 1969: 96). Curiously, the form *ci:tta* 'bad' which he has unequivocally called an adjective elsewhere in the same book (*ibid*: 76) is not included in the above list. Obviously, Antony in the reference cited above, is concerned only with non-derived forms which show adjectival function. Yet some commonly used items, which have no other function than attribution escaped Antony's attention. We are referring to forms like '*tale*' 'previous', *iṉṉa* 'this particular', *valla* 'some' (non-specific), *cila* 'few', *pala* 'many', etc. Although Antony does not accept forms like *kuṟe* 'many' or 'much' and *vaḷare* 'very' as adjectivals, his arguments for the same are not quite convincing. In the following classification we do not restrict ourselves to the examination of non-derived forms

only. All those elements, which are dependent on nouns and which together with their respective head-nouns constitute noun phrases, are included in our analysis.

4. *Classification of Malayalam Nominal Attributes*

The nominal attributes in Malayalam can be grouped into two broad classes according to their preferential choices of syntactic positions. They are *pre-nominals* and *post-nominals*. The class pre-nominals includes both inherent and derived forms. The inherent forms are those which are not morphologically derived from other form-classes while derived forms denote such forms which are resultants of some morphological processes operated upon other form classes. The various classes and their characteristic syntactic behaviours are explained hereunder.

A. Inherent Forms

In the following we have set up four classes of pre-nominal attributes which are non-derived (inherent).

(1) Demonstratives: Malayalam has two demonstratives, one proximate and the other distant. Both these forms—*i*: 'this' and *a*: 'that'—can appear before singular as well as plural head-nouns:

1.	a: kuṭṭi	'that child'
2.	a: kuṭṭikaḷ	'those children'
3.	i: ka:ryam	'this matter'
4.	i: ka:ryaṅṅaḷ	'these matters'

(2) Numerals: Among numerals the adjectival form for *onnə* 'one' is *oru* 'one' (adj) (*oṟṟa* is another form which means 'only one'); the rest appear in the attributive position without any form change. It may be argued that the form *oru* is morphologically related to the numeral *onnə* and, therefore, should not be considered as an inherent attribute. Since no demonstratable morphological operation is present in the derivation of *oru* from *onnə*, the same form is taken as inherent in this study.

5. oru maram	'one tree'
6. raṇṭu maraṅṅaḷ	'two trees'
7. nu:ṟu maraṅṅaḷ	'hundred trees'

(3) Adjectives: Malayalam has a limited number of inherent adjectives. The list given by Antony (mentioned above) does not include some items which are in frequent use. Below we are giving a list of inherent adjectives which are in common use.

Class I

(a)	nalla	'good'	periya	'big'
	putiya	'new'	pala	'various'
	paḷaya	'old'	cila	'few'
	ceṟiya	'small'	valla	'any'
	valiya	'big'	maṟṟu	'other'
	eḷiya	'humble'	maṟṟe	'the other'
	iḷaya	'young'	iṉṉa	'this particular'
(b)	o:ro:	'each'		
	ella:	'all'		
	ci:tta	'bad'		

Class II

(a)	alpam	'some'	dha:ra:ḷam	'many, much'
	svalpam	'some'	kuṟe	'many, much'
	e:ta:ṉum	'certain'	vaḷare	'many, very'
	ve:ṟe	'some other'	kuṟaccə	'some'
(b)	tale	'previous'		
	piṟṟe	'next'		

(i) All the members of the class I (a) adjectives can be nominalized by adding the respective pronominal markers, as illustrated below:

8.	nallavan	'good person' (mas)
9.	nallavaḷ	'good person' (fem)
10.	nallavar	'good persons'
11.	nallatə	'good thing'
12.	nallava	'good things'

(ii) *pala* and *cila* are semantically plurals and hence qualify only plural nouns. However the neuter singular form can be added to them but even then the derived forms denote only plural nouns.

13.	palatə	'various things'
14.	cilatə	'some things'
15.	palar	'various persons'
16.	cilar	'some persons'

(iii) Forms like *ne:riyavan*, *ne:riyavaḷ* and *ne:riyavar* designating humans are grammatically possible. Nevertheless, since they are notionally incongruous, they do not occur in common usage.

(iv) *maṟṟe* can take both singular and plural nouns whereas *maṟṟu* appears only before plurals: *maṟṟe* shows a definitive meaning besides its attributive value.

17.	maṟṟe ka:ryam	'the other matter'
18.	maṟṟe ka:ryaṅṅaḷ	'the other matters'
19.	maṟṟu ka:ryaṅṅaḷ	'other matters'

(v) The form *valla* can modify both singular and plural nouns: The head-nouns in this case take an empty morph-*um* obligatorily:

20.	valla pustakavum	'any book'
21.	valla pustakaṅṅaḷum	'any books'

(vi) The members of class I (b) do not conform to the general pattern of nominalizations and hence are grouped separately. *o:ro:* does not take the usual pronominal markers. The form *o:ro:nnə* 'each one' could be considered as a compound in

which case there is no nominalized form for this adjective. The form *ella:* is notionally plural and takes only plurals as head-nouns. The head-nouns in this case obligatorily take an empty morph-*um* (*ella: a:ḷukaḷum* 'all persons'). The nominalized forms of *ella:* are the following:

22. ella:tum — 'all things'
23. ella:varum — 'all persons'

(*ella:m* is an alternant form of *ella:tum.*)

ci:tta has the same form when it is used as a nominal. Therefore, for convenience we may consider two forms $ci:tta_1$ (attribute) and $ci:tta_2$ (noun). Both the usages are illustrated below:

24. ci:tta paṭam — 'bad picture'
25. paṭam ci:ttaya:ṇə — '(The) picture is bad'

(vii) Class II cannot be nominalized. The forms grouped as class II (b), produce these nominal items, *tale:nnə* 'previous day' and *piṟṟe:nnə* 'next day' but these two are results of compounding (*tale+annə*; *piṟṟe+annə*) rather than morphological derivations. These two adjectives have restricted occurrence. Both occur mostly before *divasam* 'day'.

26. tale divasam — 'previous day'
27. piṟṟe divasam — 'next day'

(viii) Class II (a) items are comparatively less rigid in their choices of syntactic positions than other inherent adjectives which can appear only in the pre-nominal positions. These forms can stand independently as 'fused' noun phrases, i.e. the head-nouns can be deleted if the information given by them are contextually recoverable:

28. dha:ra:ḷam samsa:riccu — 'spoke very much'
29. kuṟe naṭannu — 'walked very much'
30. vaḷare karaññu — 'cried a lot'

The above constructions should be interpreted as having the appropriate head-nouns in them:

31.	dha:ra:ḷam ka:ryaṅṅaḷ samsa:riccu	'spoke many matters'
32.	kuṟe du:ram naṭannu	'walked a lot of distance'
33.	vaḷare ne:ram karaññu	'cried for a long time'

In the following sentence,

34.	ña:n pustakaṅṅaḷ dha:ra:ḷam va:ṅṅi	'I bought many books'

it would appear that the attribute is following the noun. But the above can be explained as the result of a noun-deletion after *dha:ra:lam,* as shown below:

35.	ña:n pustakaṅṅaḷ dha:ra:ḷam eṇṇam va:ṅṅi	'I bought many number of books'

(4) Nominals and Interrogatives: Certain *nouns* and interrogatives appear pre-nominally showing attributive function:

36.	ba:kki paṇam	'the remaining money'
37.	śe:ṣam ka:ryaṅṅaḷ	'the remaining matters'
38.	atra pa:lə	'that much milk'
39.	itra veḷḷam	'this much water'
40.	e:tu pustakam	'which book'
41.	entu vila	'what price'
42.	etra ne:ram	'how much time'

The nominals in the above can be expanded by adding *uḷḷa* in which case they belong to the derived class of attributes:

43. ba:kkiyuḷḷa paṇam
44. śe:ṣamuḷḷa ka:ryaṅṅaḷ
45. atraykkuḷḷa pa:lə
46. itraykkuḷḷa veḷḷam

B. Derived Forms

Derived attributes are forms morphologically derived from other grammatical categories. Most of them fall under noun-based derivations or verb-based derivations although there are some which could be directly traced to adverbials.

(1) Genitives: Genitives are traditionally included as cases although Pa:nini never included *sambandha* under *ka:rakas.* As genitive constructions do not show any relationship with the sentence predicate, it is proper to treat them along with other attributive phrases. (See chapter on 'Genitives and Vocatives' in this work). Grammarians have not been able to specify the exact relationship, which genitive nouns exhibit in phrases. Jespersen admits that the function of the proper genitive "cannot be indicated except in the vaguest way as belonging to, or belonging together, appertaining to, connexion with, relation to or association with" (Jespersen, 1968: 180). A recent English grammar lists the various meanings of genitive as follows: (1) possessive genitive, (2) subjective genitive, (3) genitive of origin, (4) objective genitive, and (5) descriptive (Quirk, et. al, 1972: Sec. 4.94). Obviously the above list does not exhaust all the possibilities. The non-specificity of function of genitive phrases gives rise to ambiguities. For instance, *enre katha* 'my story' can mean either 'the story written by me' or 'the story about me'. A choice among various interpretations is carried out on the basis of contextual clues or on pragmatic consideration.

(2) Equatives: A noun can be equated attributively to another noun by adding *-a:ya*. This form is a relative participle of the verb *a:ku* 'to become' and hence many constructions with-*a:ya* allow interpretation either as the relativization of *a:ku* or merely as equative construction. For instance, the sentence, *po:li:suka:rana:ya go:pa:lan* can mean either 'Gopalan who has become a policeman' or simply 'the policeman, Gopalan'. In the latter sense *-a:ya* constructions cannot be treated under relativization. The phrase *sundariya:ya stri:* normally has only one interpretation as 'the beautiful woman'.

(3) Casals: All casal noun bases can be adjectivized by adding-*ulla*:

47. (nominative)—veyilulla sthalam 'sunny place'

48. (accusative)—avalo:tulla sne:ham 'love towards her'

(Here, although the normal accusative marker is replaced by *-o:ṭə* (sociative) the underlying case shows a subject—object relationship.)

49. (dative)—enikkuḷḷa pustakam 'the book which is meant for me'

(The above phrase shows similarity of meaning with the corresponding genitive phrase, *enre pustakam* 'my book'. But on closer examination it can be seen that their meanings are not identical. *enre pustakam* (in one reading) means 'the book which belongs to me' but *enikkuḷḷa pustakam* has the sense 'the book which is meant for me' without any reference to its ownership):

50. (*Instrumental*)—*vaṭikoṇṭuḷḷa aṭi* 'beating with the stick'
51. (*causal*)—paniya:luḷḷa kṣi:ṇam 'tiredness due to fever'
52. (locative)—vi:ṭṭiluḷḷa a:ḷukaḷ 'persons in the house'
53. (ablative)—kiṇarrilninnuḷḷa veḷḷam 'water from the well'
54. (directive)—aṅṅa:ṭiyile:kkuḷḷa vaḷi 'way to the bazar'
55. (*path*)—*ka:ṭṭilu:teyuḷḷa ya:tra* 'journey through the forest'
56. (topic)—aya:ḷepparriyuḷḷa a:kṣeppam 'complaint about the man'.

From locative base another type of attributives is formed by adding a particle *-e* as seen below:

57. ame:rikkayile jan̲aṅṅaḷ 'the people of America'
58. aviṭatte kuṭṭikaḷ 'children of that place'

The two locative-based attributive constructions, although substitutable in many cases, can convey different meanings. The *-e*—constructions would then mean 'belonging to the place' and *-uḷḷa*—constructions, 'existing in the place'. George Matthan has contrasted these two forms in his grammar (Matthan, 1969: 144). (See chapter on 'A unique phrasal construction' in this work.)

(4) Indicatives: The class 'indicatives' are derived not only from the major form classes, nouns and verbs, but also from various other grammatical categories like adverbials. The common

feature that distinguishes these forms from other classes of attributives is that indicatives have both 'specifying' and 'deictic' function. They differ from demonstratives in that demonstratives have only deictic function. They differ from other classes in that the deictic function is absent in them:

59. onna:matte pustakam 'first book'
60. nu:ra:matte a:ḷ 'hundredth person'
61. aññanatte manuṣyar 'people of that sort'
62. etra:matte pra:vaśyam (?)

The last example defies translation into an acceptable English form: Roughly, it means, 'how many—eth time?' In numerals the suffix—*a:matte* can be shortened to-*a:m* but then, some of such constructions convey difference in meaning:

63. onna:m pa:ṭhapustakam 'textbook for the first class'
64. onna:matte pa:ṭhapustakam 'first textbook' (implying that there are more than one text-book)

But in most cases these two constructions are semantically equivalent:

65. onna:m lo:kamaha:yuddham 'first world war'
66. onna:matte lo:kamaha:yuddham 'first world war'

The following are some other illustrations of this type:

67. ippo:ḷatte sarkka:r 'the present day government'
68. innalatte gho:ṣaya:tra 'yesterday's procession'
69. ra:vilatte bhakṣaṇam 'morning food'

(5) Relative Participle: Both the present and past tense verbs in Malayalam can be relativized. The future relative participle constructions are very rare as they appear only in very few compounds like *varumka:lam* 'the time to come':

70.	paṭhicca kuṭṭi	'child who studied'
71.	eḷutiya kattə	'letter which was written'
72.	vi:ṇa maram	'tree which fell'
73.	karayunna kuṭṭi	'child who cries'
74.	oḷukunna puḻa	'river which flows'
75.	pa:ṭunna stri:	'woman who sings'

Since the casal relationships are not overtly expressed in RP+N constructions, the exact interpretation of such phrases would be based on either the linguistic context or on pragmatic constraints. For example, the phrase, *aṭicca kuṭṭi* can refer to either 'the boy who beat some one' (subject) or 'the boy whom someone beat' (object). Here, only the linguistic context can help us for the appropriate semantic interpretation. Likewise, in the construction,

76. ta:masicca vi:ṭə

our extra-linguistic knowledge tells us that there is only one interpretation possible, i.e. 'the house in which someone lived' (locative).

Examples of negative RP constructions are given below (There is no tense distinction for negative RPs.):

77.	naṭakka:tta ka:ryam	'the matter which did/does/will not take place; impossible matter'
78.	jayikka:tta stha:—narthikaḷ	'candidates who did/do/will not succeed; unsuccessful candidates'

Normally, all RP+N phrases can be related to a sentence having the following structure:

N case+v+(N......)

But there are certain relative participles which have almost lost their verbal functions and they behave like any other inherent adjective:

79. taṇutta veḷḷam 'cold water'

80. cuvanna vastram 'red cloth'

81. ni:ṇṭa pa:ta 'long road'

82. meliñña śari:ram 'thin body'

All the above phrases can be related to corresponding N+V constructions but in which case the meanings of the sentences show deviations from the normal senses they exhibit in their phrasal manifestations. Therefore, in such cases the phrasal structure shows ambiguity. *taṇutta veḷḷam* can mean either 'water which has become cold' (the expanded sentencial structure being, '*veḷḷam taṇuttu*' 'water became cold) or 'cold water' (where there is no reference to its previous condition).

In certain cases it would appear that the RP phrases cannot be derived from underlying structures :

83. aya:ḷ paṟañña ri:ti 'the manner in which he said

84. ? (aya:ḷ ri:tiyil paṟaññu)

85. ña:n etirtta ka:raṇam 'the reason by which I opposed'

86. ? (ña:n ka:raṇamkoṇṭə etirttu)

87. avaḷ vanna ne:ram 'the time when she arrived'

88. ? (avaḷ ne:rattil vannu)

uḷḷa, the relative participle form of the existential verb *uṇṭə*, functions as an adjectivizing element in a variety of contexts. Below some such constructions are exemplified :

(adverb+uḷḷa)

89. uṟakkeyuḷḷa samsa:ram 'loud speech'

90. patukkeyuḷḷa naṭattam 'slow walk'

91. apraka:ramuḷḷa saṅgatikaḷ 'such matters'

(infinitive+uḷḷa)

92. po:ka:ṉuḷḷa samayam 'time to go'

93. cirikka:ṉuḷḷa ka:raṇam 'reason to laugh'

94. ka:ṇa:ṉuḷḷa a:graham 'desire to see'

(conditional+uḷḷa)

95.	mantrisabha takarnna:luḷḷa sthitiviśe:ṣam	'condition in case the ministry falls'
96.	ka:lavarṣam muṭaññiya:luḷḷa kṛiṣina:śaññaḷ	'agricultural losses in case monsoon fails'
97.	kuṟṟam ceyta:luḷḷa śikṣa	'punishment in case crime is committed'

C. Post-nominal specifiers

Certain post-positional forms in Malayalam show attributive function. They occur after nominals and the word-groups thus formed behave like other noun phrases. Examples of such constructions are given below:

98.	avan taṉṉe	'he himself'
99.	stri:kaḷ ma:tram	'women only'
100.	ilakaḷ okke	'all leaves'
101.	śari:ram ku:ṭi	'body also'

We don't, however, suggest that these post-positions are to be treated on par with other attributes. The matter is brought up only to show that such post-nominal forms as the above are similar to nominal attributes in meaning.

D. Appositives

Appositive noun phrases belong to a special class of nominal constructions. According to one definition, "an appositive is a noun, a noun-headed structure of modification or a structure of co-ordination made of nouns or noun-headed structure modifying a noun-head which it follows" (Francis, 1958: 301). For Lees, appositive constructions "seem to have the structure of nominal compounds" but he realizes that in many cases one would find it difficult to trace such constructions to source sentences (Lees, 1963: 172). It is true that both compounds and appositive noun phrases do not allow insertion of elements in between the components that make them. But we intutively feel that the words of appositive structure are not bound as closely as those of compounds. For instance, in the normal speech one

could have non-terminal pauses in between the words in appositive structures. This is not possible in compounds. The possibility of potential pauses is reflected in the writing system also. Thus, the appositive construction *kocci vima:natta:vaḷam* 'Cochin airport' is normally written with space in between, whereas in *talave:dana* 'headache' the spatial splitting of the two words is not done. Appositive phrases show a different kind of modificatory structure. The question, whether appositives are to be treated along with attributive noun phrases or separately, is left open here.

5. Order of Attributes

We find that the order of Malayalam attributes shows considerable flexibility. Descriptive attributes normally appear nearer to the headnoun than non-descriptive attributes. The demonstratives and numerals can appear either before or after descriptive attributes:

102. a: ceriya kuṭṭi } 'that small child'
103. ceriya a: kuṭṭi }

104. raṇṭu valiya keṭṭitaṅṅaḷ } 'two big buildings'
105. valiya raṇṭu keṭṭitaṅṅaḷ }

However, if both demonstratives and numerals appear together within the same phrase, the demonstratives should always precede the other:

106. i: raṇṭu ka:ryaṅṅaḷ } 'these two matters'
107. ? raṇṭu i: ka:ryaṅṅaḷ }

The first consideration for the choice of positions is always semantic. There does not seem to be many other restrictions in respect of the ordering.

6. Reduplication

Most of the inherent adjectives and the numerals can be reduplicated in the pre-nominal position:

108. putiya putiya kaṇṭu-piṭittaṅṅaḷ 'various new discoveries'

109.	inna inna ka:ryaññaḷ	'matters of exact specifications'
110.	vaḷare vaḷare praśnaññaḷ	'too many problems'
111.	raṇṭu raṇṭu pe:r	'two persons each'
112.	a:yirama:yiram a:ḷukaḷ	'thousands of people'

Different numerals can also combine together but in this case the combination does not show proportion or intensity as in the case of reduplication. The combination of non-identical numerals generally show approximation:

113.	eṭṭu pattu pe:r	'eight or ten persons approximately'
114.	nu:ṟu nu:ṟṟampatu ru:pa	'about hundred or hundred and fifty rupees'

7. Conclusion

The above is not being claimed to be an exhaustive study of attributive constructions in Malayalam. We have only tried to throw light on some of the more important characteristic features of the same. There is indeed scope for a more detailed study. For instance, we have not discussed the behaviour of attributes as intensifiers. Intensifiers refer to any device "that scales a quality, whether up or down or somewhere between the two" (Bolinger, 1972: 17). In Malayalam most of the class II (a) inherent adjectives can function as intensifiers. Some of the attributes have lost their primary meanings and behave predominantly as intensifiers in the language. A good example for this is the form *bhayaṅkarama:ya* which means 'fearful'. In the following constructions the same is used as an intensifier only:

115.	bhayaṅkarama:ya viśappə	'too much hunger'
116.	bhayaṅkarama:ya cu:ṭə	'too much heat'

three

The Copula

0. A Non-Dravidian (?) feature

The structure of the copulative sentence in Malayalam is unique in that no other Dravidian language resembles Malayalam in this respect.[1] In other Dravidian languages the structure 'Noun+Noun' has the full status of a sentence. But Malayalam requires a copula verb in such constructions. This special feature which exists only in one of the member-languages of the Dravidian family demands the attention of linguists. Curiously, this unique phenomenon has not been adequately discussed by Dravidiologists. The comparative method (at least, as far as Dravidian languages are concerned) concentrated on phonology and morphology ignoring the syntactic innovations (though rarely) that had taken place in individual languages. Investigations on the methods of reconstruc-

tions in the areas of phonology and morphology have advanced relying on new findings and augumented by refined methods and techniques. Thus several plausible conjectures have been postulated regarding these two levels of proto-Dravidian. The syntax and (more evidently) the semantics of proto-Dravidian remain as virgin fields for future comparativists to explore.

The sub-heading given to this section implies that the feature under discussion is non-Dravidian. Why should we consider the usage of a connecting verb in copula—sentences a phenomenon alien to Dravidian? The existence of this syntactic feature only in one language strengthens the hypothesis that the proto-Dravidian syntax was devoid of the copula verb. Another fact which adds strength to the above supposition is the particular verb in Malayalam which is used in copula-sentences. The copula verb in Malayalam is *a:kunnu* (present tense form) and the derived form *a:ṇə*, used in the same manner, is traceable to the former. (The derivation of *a:ṇə* from *a:kunnu* will be explained below). Historically, the form *a:kunnu* is earlier. This can be deduced from an examination of old records in Malayalam. A comparison of the cognates of *a:ku* in Dravidian reveals that the primary meaning of the verbal root s 'exist' or 'become'.[2] If that is so, the meaning of 'equation' or 'connection' must be a later development. Then the real copula must have been absent in proto-Dravidian. The situation is not different in Indo-European. Most of the modern Indo-European languages (or, all?) have copula verb within their systems but corresponding constructions in proto-Indo-European seem to have been verbless (Kahn, 1973). The Indo-Aryan sub-group also falls in line with the above. The structure of copular sentences in Sanskrit could be verbless but its descendants—the modern Indo-Aryan languages—invariably make use of the copula verb. The use of a copula verb is found to be a later development in several language families and therefore, the surmise, that the same is the case in Dravidian too, seems to be well-founded.

1. Functions of Copula

What could have been the reason for the non-existence of the copula verb in ancient languages? This question posed a

challenging problem to philosophers and logicians. The immediate problems that our ancestors were confronting in their environment might have been 'existence' and 'change'. Consequently, all languages possessed verbs of existence (stative) and verbs of change (active) right from the beginning. Since mere 'linkage' was unimportant (relatively speaking) from the point of view of early human races, the necessity of a verb showing such a notion was not felt. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the environmental significances reflected in the speeches of the pre-historic communities. The function of connection could not have been a significant feature in the primitive culture and therefore their languages did not make use of a copula verb.

Another evidence which leads to the conjecture of the non-existence of the copula verb in the early stages of language history is the non-appearance of the copula in the initial stages of the language acquisition process. Cross-cultural studies on linguistic ontogeny have revealed that children rarely resort to the usage of forms which do not have lexical meanings and which serve only some grammatical functions. In other words, children prefer content words to function words in their telegraphic structures. It is possible that certain characteristics of the child language reflect the features of the early stages of language history. Socio-linguistic investigations report that on many occasions of inter-personal communications, and also in pidgins and creoles, the copula is invariably dropped (Ferguson, 1971; Labov, 1969).

The general contention of linguists is that the copula doesn't have lexical meaning since it appears only as a functor showing a syntactic relationship. In sentences the predication is commonly denoted by the verb. Majority of verbs do have lexical meanings. But on occasions when the sentence-meaning is fully expressed by the non-verbal constituents of the structure, there should be some device to show the function of the predication. The copula serves that purpose. The function of the copula is to convert the noun or adjective so as to be used as predicator (Quine, 1960: 96f). The opinion, that copula is not a constituent of deep structure

but has the role of a 'dummy verb' only, also indicates its non-lexical status (Lyons, 1968: 322).

Two theories exist in Generative Grammar regarding the status of copula. Scholars like Bach and Lakoff do not consider copula as an element of deep structure. The copula, according to them is only a surface feature which is brought in by 'transformational insertion'.

Ross treats the verb 'be' in its copular function as a main verb in the deep structure. Agreeing with Ross's claim that 'be' is a main verb, Darden (1969: 30) however, shows that the copula can be a verb without being in the deep structure. He concludes his arguments thus: "Since 'be' could be substituted for either plus or minus stative, it would have no set meaning, and this would explain the apparent transparency of 'be'. 'Be' would be a surface neutralization of an underlying distinction in stativity" (*ibid*: 35). The controversy regarding the status of copula has not been settled until now. We are not directly concerned, here, with the derivational history of the copula verb.

Among Malayalam grammarians only Matthan and Gundert have attempted to discuss the peculiarities of the Malayalam copula. Matthan states: "Since the function of the verb is to show the relationship between the subject and predicate, strictly speaking, there are only two pure verbs, namely *a:kunnu* (be-positive) and *alla* (be not-negative)" (Matthan, 1969: 112). This may perhaps seem to be contradicting the Western scholars' views on copula. But Matthan does not basically differ from them. In both views, the copula is said to be having only the predicative function. The Malayalam grammarian goes a step further and asks: 'The verbness of a verb is to be determined not on the basis of its lexical meaning but on its predicative function. Therefore shouldn't we call, the copula which has only the predicative function, the pure verb?' Gundert (1962: 115) categorically states that the copula is not required when the predicate is noun. Further, "when we consider its power, it might be called 'pronominal verb(?)" (*ibid*: 246). From these remarks it is clear that Gundert has recognized the unique status of the Malayalam copula.

Frohnmeyer, although he has not described the peculiarities of the Malayalam copula, however, points out that *a:kunnu*, *a:ṇə* and *a:* are alternants of the copula in Malayalam (Frohnmeyer, 1913: 18).

2. The derivation of the form a:ṇə

The copula in Malayalam appears in three forms, namely, *a:kunnu*, *a:ṇə* and *a:*. Among these the first occurs only in the literary dialect. The second might have been the form which in early times existed only in the spoken dialect. But now *a:ṇə* has gained currency in the literary dialect also.

It is clear that *a:* is a contracted form of *a:ṇə*. This last shortened variety is the predominant form which is used in the present-day spoken dialect.

The form *a:ṇə* is derivationally related to *a:kunnu*. The sound changes that had happened here demand special attention as they do not fall under the regular phonological changes which the language had gone through at different stages of its history. The formation of *a:ṇə* can be explained with reference to a particular way of pronunciation of the present tense verbs in Malayalam. In almost all (if not, all) regional dialects the present tense ending *-unnu* is pronounced as *-uṇu.*[3] ex:—*naṭakkunnu*>*naṭakkuṇu*, *po:kunnu*>*po:ṇu*. Accordingly, the form *a:kunnu* could appear as *a:kuṇu* in speech. The derivative 'k' in monosyllabic roots shows a tendency of being dropped in South Dravidian.[4] If that be so, *a:kuṇu* can also become *a:ṇu*. No special explanation is needed for the change of the word-final rounded 'u' into the central unrounded 'ə' as this centralization is not uncommon in spoken dialect.[5]

3. The history of the usuage of copula

It is not possible to know the period from which Malayalam had started using copula as connectors in NP–NP sentences. In ancient inscriptions and literary works we do not have instances of copula verbs being used in sentences where it could be expected to occur. This does not, however, indicate the absence of the

usage of the copula in the spoken dialects of those days. In official records, public announcements and contracts, the contexts normally do not demand the expression of the meaning of copula. Likewise, the poetical works also, being more narrative than declarative, the instances of copular sentence-structure are presumably rare. Therefore, we have to turn our attention to prose works for tracing the history of the usage of copula verb. Ezhuthachan reports that a peculiar construction of verbalization by adding *o:* is frequent in 'Bha:ṣa:kauṭali:yam' (12–13 C.AD.), the earliest available prose work in Malayalam (Ezhuthachan, 1960: XLVI). The examples cited by him show that sentences containing the post-form *-o:* exhibit other meanings also. There is another form *a:vitu* in the same work which is used as expression of the copular meaning as below:

1. khaṉi a:vitu poṉṉakaṇṇu koḷḷumeṭam. (p. 15)

But many of the copula sentences in 'Bha:ṣa:kauṭali:yam' are clearly verbless. Later prose works also abound in verbless copula sentences (Narayana Piḷḷai, 1951):

2. itu ka:ṇa: maṭaya:, ña:ṉoru parade:śi, eṉṉe u:ṭṭaveṇṭum.

(Naḷo:pa:khya:ṉam)

3. marakkalattiṉu aṭiccarakku maṇal; śari:rattiṉṉaṭiccarakku malam.

(Ambari:ṣo:pa:khya:ṉam)

It is in the prose works of eighteenth century that we find common occurrences of copula verb: The prose works of the christian missionaries might have popularized the usage of copula. The following sentences are from 'Varttama:ṉapustakam' (1785) by Paremaṉakkal To:ma:kkattaṉa:r, a native christian missionary (the extracts are taken from Achuthanunni & Chandanappalli, 1967):

4. atentenna:l viṣamamuṇṭa:kunnatu uṭayatampura:ṉṉu teḷiva:kunna ka:ryattiṉuḷḷa aṭaya:ḷamatre a:kunnu.

(p. 41)

5. niṅṅaḷuṭe maitra:n pu:kkoṭṭu irikkunnatallo a:kunnu. (p. 63)

6. ñaṅṅaḷ vendhikkunna ka:ryamallo a:kunnu. (p. 63)

A noteworthy feature of the above constructions is that the copula follows clitics like *allo* and *atre*. These clitics themselves are capable of showing the predicative function elsewhere. Therefore, the 'clitic-copula' usage seems to represent an intermediate stage in the development of copula sentences in Malayalam. A century later, the structure of copula sentences becomes similar to the modern usage as seen in certain articles (1865–1867) of Geevarugis Kathanar (Chummar, 1969: 70):

7. akhila:ṇḍam brahmama:kunnu.

8. enna:l bhu:lo:kattil manuṣyanṯanṉe pradha:ṉi ennuḷḷatu tarkkamaṟṟa oru samgatiya:kunnu.

Comparing the languages of two Malayalam grammars of the later half of the last century—'Malaya:ḷmayuṭe Vya:karaṇam' by George Matthan, 1863 and 'Malaya:ḷabha:ṣa:vya:karaṇam' by Gundert, 1868—one is able to see marked differences in them. Matthan prefers to use the copula but the foreigner resorts to both verb-present and verbless usages. Gundert has indeed recognized the copular function of the Malayalam verb *a:kunnu* (Gundert, 1962:246) but has not exemplified its present finite form, although examples for its emphatic function and participal form are illustrated in his grammar (*ibid*: 249–250). It is rather surprising to note his preference to copular verbless sentences.[6]

The above discussion leads us to the view that the usage of copula got rooted in Malayalm only in the beginning of nineteenth century, though it might have crept into the speech much earlier. It is also possible that contact with western languages, the manifestations of which are found in the prose literature of christian missionaries, helped its establishment as an essential grammatical requirement in the copula sentences of Malayalam.

4. **Copula in sentence structure**

Asher discussing the phenomenon in detail, suggests the following classification for Malayalam sentences involving the use of copula (Asher, 1968: 96):

A. with nominals:

9. kuṭṭi peṇṇa:ṇə,
'The child is (a) girl'

10. kaḷḷuṣa:ppə oru o:lakkeṭṭiṭam a:ṇə[7]
'The toddy shop is a leaf-surfaced hut'

B. identity:

11. avan jo:ṇ a:ṇə
'He is John'

12. a: to:ṭṭi cuṭalamuttu a:ṇə
'That scavenger is Chudalamuthu'

C. Role:

13. adde:ham do:kṭar a:ṇə
'He is (a) doctor'

14. avarum to:ṭṭikaḷ a:ṇə
'They too are scavengers'

D. With spatial nouns:

15. avan eviṭeya:ṇə
'Where is he'

16. avan tiruvanantapuratta:ṇə
'He is in Trivandrum'

Asher has not attempted to show that the above four classes are structurally different. We feel that the above classification has resulted in over-differentiation on the one hand, and has failed to account for certain other constructions, on the other. We, therefore, suggest the following classification:

A. Equative.

B. Locational.

C. Experiential.

D. Emphatic.

The first three divisions suggested by Asher are not dissimilar in their basic structure. They are grouped here under 'equative'. Asher's copular sentences consisting of spatial nouns in the predicate go to our 'locational' class. It is true that both the 'experiential' and 'emphatic' sentences are referred to by Asher elsewhere (*ibid*: 99–100; 107–108). The auxilary function of *a:ṇə* is also discussed by him (*ibid*: 109). Yet another usage which he cites appears to us as peculiar and odd in standard Malayalam. Quoting sequences like *vi:ṭə vṛittiya:ṇə* (The house is clean) and *avaḷ vi:ṭə vṛittiya:kkunnu* (She cleans the house), Asher labels the former pure copular structure and the latter a corresponding causative construction. Even if we consider the pure copular sentence as acceptable standard form, it requires no special explanation as the same is taken care of by our A–class structure, mentioned above. Such constructions are similar to sentences like *atə mano:harama:ṇə* (It is beautiful) in which the non-copula predicate element is not an adjective as could be seen from expressions like *avan mano:harana:ṇə* (He is beautiful), *avaḷ mana:hariya:ṇə* (She is beautiful), etc. Adjectives do not appear as predicatives in Dravidian languages. Further, *avaḷ vi:ṭə vṛittiya:kkunnu* need not be analysed as a causative sentence. The confusion seems to have come from the pair *a:kunnu* (*copula*)–*a:kkunnu* which although formally resembles a non-causal–causal pair, does not, in the above case, involve semantically correlational verbs. *vṛittiya:kkuka* should be taken as a phrasal verb like *prasamgam ceyyuka, jo:li eṭukkuka, kaṇakka:kkuka*, etc.[8]

5. Classification of copulative sentences

We shall in this section examine each of the above classes of copula-sentences in Malayalam.

A. Equative:

17. adde:ham profasar a:ṇə
'He is (a) professor'

18. a: kuṭṭi samartthan a:ṇə
'That boy is clever'

19. avan ba:buva:ṇə
'He is Babu'

Sentences like the above are 'equatives' because two NPs are equated in them. Nonetheless, there seems to be a semantic constraint which prevents converting all of them into attributive nominal phrases. Although constructions like *profasara:ya adde:ham* and *samartthaṉa:ya a: kuṭṭi* are acceptable, the same transformation brings forth a questionable expression in the case of (19) as ' *ba:buva:ya avan* appears to be ill-formed. Structurally identical sentences need not always give semantically congruent sequences. The oddness of the attributive phrase corresponding to (19) seems to be due to the semantic incompatibility of a general term being described by a particular term. Normally descriptive attributes are used to denote the general characteristics of either a class of general terms or a particular term. Another noteworthy feature of these attributive phrases is that they are potentially ambiguous strings (see chapter on 'Nominal attributes' in this book).

B. Locational:

20. Jayan sku:ḷila:ṇə
'Jayan is in (the) school'

21. pe:ṉa me:śayila:ṇə
'(The) pen is in(the) table'

22. ve:daṉa ka:lila:ṇə
'(The) pain is in the leg'

In sentences 20 through 22 locative NPs appear in the VPs and hence such constructions are called 'locational'. No other casal relationship appears in the VP (except in usages where the copula is an 'emphatic' marker. See below).[9] Asher (*ibid*: 101–102) has pointed out that the above structures allow the usage of 'existential' verbs (*uṇṭə*) and that the two expressions have different referential meanings.

C. Experiential:

23. eṉikkə iṣṭama:ṇə
'for me—likeness—is'
'I like'

24. avaḷkkə paṉiya:ṇə
'for her—fever—is'
'She has fever'

25. aya:ḷkkə pe:ṭiya:ṇə
'for that person—fear—is'
'He has fear'

Sentences of the above type are unique in the sense that they do not require the presence of 'subjects' (see the chapter on 'Subjectless sentences' in this book for more details). Ordinarily, the VPs of these sentences contain abstract nouns according to Asher (*ibid*: 100). A closer examination, perchance, would show that nouns denoting experience are predicated in them.

D. Emphatic:

26. avan innale vannu
'He came yesterday'

can be transformed into,

(a) avaṉa:ṇə innale vannatə
'It was he who came yesterday'

(b) avan innaleya:ṇə vannatə
'It was yesterday that he came'

(c) avan innale varukaya:ṇə ceytatə
'What he did on yesterday was coming'.

Consider also the following transformations:

27. ña:n kaḷiñña a:ḷca ko:ṭṭayattu veccə adde:hatte kaṇṭu
'Last week, I saw him at Kottayam'

(a) ña:ṉa:ṇə...............kaṇṭatə

(b) ña:n kaḷiñña aḷcaya:ṇə..............kaṇṭatə

(c) ña:n..............ko:ṭṭayattu vecca:ṇə.........kaṇṭatə

(d) ña:n...............adde:hatteya:ṇə kaṇṭatə

(e) ña:n..............ka:ṇukaya:ṇə ceytatə

What happens here is that a constituent of the sentence is emphasized in (a) to (e) sentences. If a sentence is divided into a 'topic' and a 'comment' the predication necessarily goes with the latter. A device to shift the predication to any particular constituent of a sentence is to indicate it by emphasis. One of the ways of emphasizing an element in Malayalam sentence is to

attach the copula to it as seen in the above transformations. Sentence (26) does not carry any emphasis and therefore is neutral. The predication naturally falls on the VP, i.e. '*innale vannu*'. But in 26 (a) the logical predication is shifted to the NP, *avan* and the interpretation of the utterance will be as follows: 'Someone came yesterday and that someone is he'. Similarly, in 26 (b), the information 'he came' is topic and 'yesterday' is comment. In all these sentences the copula, *a:ṇə* has a focussing function.[10]

When the predicate of a sentence has a copula in it, it has not only the function of predication but also an emphasizing function. Examine the following:

27. (a) aya:ḷ va:yan̲aśa:layil uṇṭə
    (b) aya:ḷ va:yan̲aśa:layil a:ṇə
    'He is in the library'

The English translation given above fails to indicate the subtle difference in the implications of 27 (a) and (b). In the (b)—sentence the predicate is emphasized in the sense that 'he is nowhere else but is in the library'. This additional import is due to the usage of the copula. See also the following pair:

28. (a) kuṭṭikkə pan̲iyuṇṭə
    (b) kuṭṭikkə pan̲iya:ṇə
    'The child is suffering from fever'

28 (a) can be transformed into an emphatic sentence as *kuṭṭikkə pan̲iya:ṇə uḷḷatə*. The meaning of this emphatic sentence and that of the (b)—sentence above are not different. In the interrogative *kuṭṭikkə pan̲iyuṇṭo*: there is no presupposition that 'the child is suffering'. Such a presupposition exists in the corresponding interrogated form of 28 (b), *kuṭṭikkə pan̲iya:ṇo*:

A further evidence, to show that in existential sentences (as exemplified above in 27 (a) and (b)) the usage of the copula gives an emphatic meaning, besides the existential meaning, is the non-occurrence of 29 (b) (in ordinary discourse) as against 29 (a):

29. (a) mañjeriyil kɒ:ḷe:juṇṭə
    'There is (a) college in Manjeri'
    (b) ? mañjeriyil ko:ḷe:ja:ṇə:[11]

6. Copula as auxilary

The progressive aspect is shown in Malayalam by any one of the following types of sentences:

30. avaḷ pa:ṭikkoṇṭirikkunnu.

31. avaḷ pa:ṭunnuṇṭə.

32. avaḷ pa:ṭukaya:ṇə.
'She is singing'

In (30) the auxilary construction denotes 'only' the progressive aspect. (31) and (32), besides being 'progressive' are grammatically and semantically different from (30). An obvious semantic difference is that (31) and (32) can also be used to refer to future events unlike (30):

33. ñan na:ḷe sinimaykkə po:kunnuṇṭə
'I will be going to cinema tomarrow'

34. aṭutta ma:sam adde:ham jo:liyilninnə oḷiyukaya:ṇə
'He will be retiring from service next month'

A similar construction is not possible in the case of the first type of auxilary seen above in (30):

35. ? raṇṭu ma:sattiṉuśe:ṣam ñaññaḷ na:ṭṭil po:yikkoṇṭirikkunnu.

Next we have to see how the other two—*uṇṭə* and *a:ṇə*—auxilaries differ. Asher, in his article, states that the differentiation of these two constructions is not easy (*ibid:* 109). Although the two verbs can appear in the same structure as seen in (31) and (32), the same is not possible in all speech contexts. On hearing the sound of the approaching train one may pass the information of the event to another utterring *vaṇṭi varunnuṇṭə.* The other form *vaṇṭi varukaya:ṇə* will not convey that information in that context. This shows that they are semantically non-equivalent. The first of the above makes a 'statement' while the other (with *a:ṇə*) emphasizes a point, implicitly denying a possible different supposition.

We have seen that both *a:ṇə* and *uṇṭə* appear as auxilaries, but structurally these auxilary—constructions are different from others. Most of the auxilaries in Malayalam are stringed to the past verbal participles. Here *uṇṭə* is added to the present tense finite form and *a:ṇə* to the tenseless infinitive. Other auxilary constructions can be nominalized[12] but these two do not submit to that transformation as shown below:

36. (a) ammu va:yiccukoṇṭirikkunnu
'Ammu is reading'

(b) va:yiccukoṇṭirikkunna ammu
'Ammu who is reading......'

37. (a) ammu va:yikkunnuṇṭə

(b) ?

38. (a) ammu va:yikkukaya:ṇə

(b) ?

27. Conclusion

Several innovations have taken place in Malayalam during the history of its evolution as an independent language from proto-South Dravidian. Many of these are related to the phonological and morphological levels. Malayalam does not show many differences in syntax from its genetically related sister-languages. One of the noteworthy innovations that has become rooted in the west-coast dialect is the obligatory use of the copula verb in equative constructions. The eighteenth century prose literature of Christian Missionaries—usually referred to as *pa:tirimalaya:ḷam*, 'Priest Malayalam'—was responsible in popularizing this type of sentences. The copula in Malayalam shows various grammatical functions. Its unique status among Malayalam verbs necessitates the treatment of the same as a separate grammatical category.

NOTES :

1. Kothandaraman (1972) argues that even in Tamil there are many instances where the use of copula at the surface level is obligatory although the NP—NP sentences do not have it. Even in equative constructions, according to him, the underlying constituent structure should contain the copula verb, the disappearance of which can be accounted for by a 'deletion transformation rule'.

2. Is it possible to suppose that the proto-Dravidian root *a:ku* had both existential and copulative meanings?

3. The change, *-unnu> -uṇu* involves the weakening of the nasal consonant (the geminate becoming single) and also the backing of the position of the articulation (from dental to cerebral). It is possible that the first of the above—the weakening of the articulation—might be due to the effort involved in pronouncing the double consonants of strong verbs in successive syllables. The second—the receding of the articulatory position—could have been motivated by the appearance of the back vowel on both sides.

4. This is not a regular change. In Tamil also, there are cases of the medial -k- being dropped as in *po:kiṉe:n>po:ṉe:n*.

5. It is strange that a feature of spoken dialect has influenced the standard language so much.

6. Malaya:yma eḻuti ka:ṇunna akṣaraṅṅaḷ raṇṭu vidham.

   Onnu pura:ṇama:yi naṭappuḷḷa vaṭṭeḻuttə............atippo:ḻum co:ṉakarkkə prama:ṇam. tamiḻeḻutte: a:śrayiceatutaṉṉe. raṇṭa:matə, samskṛtagranthaṅṅaḷil mumpe naṭappa:ya a:rya eḻuttə......' (Gundert, 1962:25)

7. Most of Asher's examples are taken from modern Malayalam fiction.

8. All languages have phrasal verbs. In 'ra:jan ra:dhaye viva:ham ceytu' (Rajan married Radha), if 'cey' alone is taken as the verb, what is the status of the noun 'viva:ham' in the sentence? It is better to consider 'viva:ham cey' as a phrasal verb, the 'cey' functioning here only as a verbalizer.

9. One can point out constructions like,

   i: vi:ṭə niṅṅaḷkka:ṇə
   'This houee is for you'
   a: bassə a:lappuḻaykka:ṇə
   'That bus is to Allepey'
   avaṉṭe ya:tra madra:silu:teya:ṇə
   'His journey is through Madras'

and claim that the predicate contains nouns associated with other cases also. The first of the above is an elliptical structure of the emphatic construction, because the nominalized form is 'niṅṅaḷkkuḷḷa i: vi:tə'. The other two also behave similarly. In 'viva:ham eṭṭumaṇikka:ṇə' the surface dative expression is related to an underlying locative.

10. Suprasegmentals also can bring about the focussing. Chafe's (1970: 210–233) division of propositions into 'old' and 'new' information deals with the same phenomenon.

11. In 'mañje:riyil ko:ḷe:junṭə' the locative noun is topic and the rest comment. There is no rule that the topic should be in the nominative. Also, we cannot always correlate topic with subject.

12. Usually all auxilaries (except rare instances of tenseless constructions) which carry tense distinctions can be relativized. 'a:ṇə' and 'uṇṭə' are exceptions to this rule. Auxilaries which do not indicate tenses cannot be relativized.

four

Post-positions

0. Introduction

Besides the major grammatical categories of noun and verb (and for some attribute, both nominal and verbal), a third class of linguistic units, variously classified under post-positions (*anuprayo:ga* or *gati*), indeclinables (*avyaya*) and clitics or particles (*nipa:ta*), is dealt with in Malayalam grammars. This grammatical phenomenon has not been adequately described in traditional Malayalam grammars. We shall first examine these inadequacies. Later, we would attempt to explicate certain syntactic and semantic characteristics of Malayalam post-positions.

1. Treatment of post-positions in Malayalam Grammars

1.1. Gundert has given a long list of indeclinables (Gundert, 1962: 111–114). Certain other dependent forms which appear

word-finally are called defective verbs (*u:ṉakriya*) by him (*ibid*: 107–110). Elsewhere, he has attempted to provide a very general picture of their usages (*ibid*: 214–219). However, since he has not clearly differentiated the functions of the forms which he has called defective verb, auxilary verb and indeclinable, his analysis does not help us in understanding the theoretical import of each of the above classes.

1.2. For Matthan, there are only three word-classes, namely, noun, verb and indeclinable. All the items which lie outside the purview of nouns and verbs are grouped under the nomenclature 'indeclinable' (Matthan, 1969: 151–163). He states: "Indeclinable (*avyaya*) is a word which does not usually submit to morphological change and which shows a relationship between nouns and verbs; such forms as *-um, -o:, kuṟiccə, me:l*" (*ibid*: 163). Notice the inclusion of particles like *-um* (conjunctive) and *-o:* (interrogative), thereby elevating (wrongly, of course) them into the status of word. He, however, makes a more cautious statement immediately after the above. Discussing the functions of indeclinables, he says that there are certain linguistic forms which are neither nouns nor verbs and they include 'certain relational sounds and words.' They are named as *avyayas* (*ibid*: 164). This amounts to mean (contrary to his earlier definition) that indeclinables consist of not only words but also non-words. He is therefore led to make a classification of 'pure indeclinable' (*mu:la:vyaya*) and 'derived indeclinable' (*taddhita:vyaya*) (*ibid*: 164). Consideration of the derived indeclinable as a word ignores its nature of obligatory dependence to a content-word. Hence Matthan's grammar also fails to present a convincing picture of the phenomenon.

1.3. Meaningful sound sequences are divided into content-words (*va:caka*) and function-words (*dyo:taka*) by Rajaraja Varma; the former class consists of three categories, namely, noun, verb and attribute and the latter of two categories, namely, particle (*nipa:ta*) and indeclinable (*avyaya*) (Rajaraja Varma 1974: 138–139). Function-words, according to him, do not by themselves denote meanings independently. But interjec-

tions (*vya:kṣe:paka*), which are shown as a sub-class of function-words, can reveal 'the meanings of sentences by themselves, (*ibid*: 140). Most of the post-positions (*gati*, for him) are discussed under function-words. His list of post-positions includes not only such items as *ninnə*, *veccə*, but also suffixes like – *u:ṭe*. Thus, it will be seen that Rajaraja Varma's analysis contains self-contradictory statements and ill-defined terms.

1.4. By introducing the terms 'loose post-positions', Ramaswami Aiyyar seems to have recognized the distinct combinatory status of post-positions (Ramaswami Aiyyar, 1936: 19). Unfortunately, he has also grouped bound units like *-u:ṭe*, *-e:l*, etc. along with the loose post-positions such as *kuṟiccə*, *toṭṭə*, *koṇṭə* and *ve:ṇṭi* (*ibid*: 22).

1.5. Kunnappally has followed Rajaraja Varma in his treatment of post-positions. Curiously, he has used the term preposition as the English equivalent for the Malayalam *gati* (Kunnappally, 1976: 160). His list also includes several forms which cannot be considered as belonging to the class under consideration (*ibid*: 160–61).

1.6. The foregoing brief survey reveals that the grammatical literature in Malayalam does not provide us with a clear picture of the linguistic phenomenon of post-position in the language. It becomes necessary, therefore, to establish that, on the basis of certain characteristics, a category of post-positions can be set up in Malayalam as distinct from other word-classes on the one hand, and from bound forms, on the other. We shall attempt to do so in the ensuing sections.

2. Uniqueness of post-positions

2.1. Literally, suffixes and the non-initial components of word-compounds are 'post-positions'. It is clear that we are not using the term in its literal sense, as the elements cited above are not usually referred to by the term 'post-position'. Therefore, our first task is to differentiate this category from suffixes and non-initial components of compounds.

2.2. Our instinct may tell us that post-positions are not dependent to the extent the suffixes are in the language. Suffixes can always occur as integral parts of words. Post-positions, on the other hand, can be separated from words to which they are semantically associated in certain restricted syntactic constructions as exemplified below:

1. (a) praca:rave:lakoṇṭum paṇamkoṇṭum
   terañÑeṭuppil jayikka:n kaḷiyumo:

   (b) praca:rave:layum paṇavumkoṇṭə
   terañÑeṭuppil jayikka:n kaḷiyumo:

'Can (one) win the election by propaganda and money?'

2. (a) bha:ṣayekkuṟiccum sa:hityattek-
   kuṟiccum pala nalla granthaṅṅaḷum
   adde:ham eḷutiyiṭṭuṇṭə

   (b) bha:sayeyum sa:hityatteyum
   kuṟiccə pala nalla granthaṅṅaḷum
   adde:ham eḷutiyiṭṭuṇṭə

'He has written many good books on language and literature'

3. (a) poṉṉa:ṉiyilninnum guruva:yu:ril–
   ninnum a:lappuḷaykkə
   eksprassubassukaḷ uṇṭə

   (b) poṉṉa:ṉiyilum guruva:yu:ril–
   umninnə a:lappuḷaykkə
   eksprassubassukaḷ uṇṭə

'There are express bus services from Ponani and Guruvayur to Allepey'

Notice how the post-positions *koṇṭə*, *kuṟiccə* and *ninnə* are dislocated in the (b) sentences above. Suffixes denoting gender, number, case, etc. do not submit to similar dispositions.

2.3. In compounds the non-initial words are, no doubt, syntactically bound to the pre-elements of the composite structure. Yet they can also appear as independent words in sentences. Post-positions can never occur as independent components of a

sentence-structure. Many of the forms which appear as post-positions do have independent occurrences showing other syntactic functions. A few examples are given below:

4. (a) avaḷeppaṟṟi eṉikkə onnum aṟiyilla (*paṟṟi*-post-position)
   'I do not know anything about her'

   (b) eṉikkə oru teṟṟu paṟṟi (*paṟṟi*-verb)
   'I happened to commit a mistake'

5. (a) aya:ḷtaṉṉe ceyyeṇṭa ka:ryam a:ṇatə (*taṉṉe*-post-position)
   'That is a matter which should be done by that person himself'

   (b) ni: taṉṉeya:ṇo: vannaṭə (*taṉṉe*-adverb)
   'Did you come alone?'

6. (a) ra:vile pattumaṇikkuśe:ṣam addeːham vi:ṭṭil uṇṭa:villa (*śe:ṣam*—post-position)
   'He would not be in (his) house after 10.O'clock in the morning'

   (b) 'śe:ṣam ka:ryaṅṅaḷ piṉṉi:ṭə niścayikka:m (*śe:ṣam*—adjective)
   'The remaining matters can be decided later'

2.4. The differentiating characteristics of post-positions from auxilary verbs, which also behave as closely-knit elements with the preceding main verbs, will have to be explicated in order to establish their uniqueness. Although auxilaries cannot be dispositioned and do not allow insertion of other words within the construction, they are vulnerable to morphological modifications as any other verb. See below:

7. (a) muttaśśi eṉikkə oru katha paṟaññutannu
   'Grandmother told me a story'

   (b) muttaśśi eṉikkə oru katha paṟaññutarunnu.
   'Grandmother tells me a story'

(c) muttaśśi eṉikkə oru katha paṟaññutarum
'Grandmother will tell me a story'

(d) muttaśśi eṉikkə oru katha paṟaññutaraṇam
'Grandmother must tell me a story'

There are only rare instances where auxilaries cannot be modified as above. The following sentence-form is one such example:

8. avaḷ vannuka:ṇum
'She would have come'

Another feature by which post-positions and auxilary verbs differ is that the latter occur in combination with verbs only. Post-positions, on the other hand, mostly combine with nouns and rarely with non-finite forms of verbs (as below):

9. paṟaññaśe:ṣam
'after saying'

10. eḷuta:ntaṉṉe
'to write' (emphatic)

11. ka:ṇukama:tram
'Only seeing'

12. vanna:lma:tram mati
'It is enough that (you) come only'

Phrases 9–12 are instances of post-positions occuring after verbals. 9 and 10, above, can also be expressed through nominals without change of meaning.

9. (a) paṟaññatiṉuśe:ṣam

10. (a) eḷutunnatiṉutaṉṉe

'*ka:ṇuka*' in 11 is a verbal noun. Consequently, we have only few instances like 12, where post-positions are semantically related to verbal forms. Only very few items behave like this. (Because of the variations in functions and difference in the positions of occurrences, the classes of items discussed here are sometimes differentiated as 'post-positions', 'clitics' and 'verbal particles'.)

3. Syntactic and semantic behaviours of post-positions

3.1. Post-positions in Malayalam are syntactically and semantically noun-dependent (except few instances of which reference has already been made above). The noun-dependent post-position complexes can be adjectivized as illustrated below:

13. pantukoṇṭuḷḷa kaḷi
    'play with ball'

14. ka:vyaśailiyekkuṟiccuḷḷa oru grandham
    'a book on poetic style'

15. vi:ṭṭiltaṉṉeyuḷḷa ta:masam
    'stay in the house itself'

16. bo:ṇassiṉuve:ṇṭiyuḷḷa samaram
    'fight for the bonus'

17. paṉimu:lamuḷḷa kṣi:ṇam
    'tiredness due to fever'

18. madira:śiyilninnuḷḷa vaṇṭi
    'train from Madras'

Since the possibility of adjectivization is a regular feature of these constructions, they can well be considered as a sub-category of nominal phrases.

3.2. Whether the post-positions are added to nominal bases or to other grammatical forms, they do not modify or change the 'category function' of the base structure. This constraint excludes forms like *-a:ya*, *-uḷḷa* and *-a:yi* from the class of post-positions because their additions convert the base forms to different word-classes.

3.3. On the basis of the combinatory possibilities, Malayalam post-positions can broadly be divided into two classes. Such of those forms, which appear only after restricted environments, may be called 'restricted' and the others which combine with more than single base-forms may be called 'non-restricted'. The two classes are exemplified below:

Restricted :

(i) koṇṭə, kuṟiccə, paṟṟi...(after accusative nominal bases)

(ii) ve:ṇṭi, śe:ṣam...(after dative nominal bases)

(iii) praka:ram, mutal, vare...(after nominative nominal bases)

(iv) veccə, ninnə...(after locative nominal bases)

Non-restricted :

ku:ṭi, ma:tram, taṉṉe...(after all casal bases)

3.4. It is deemed proper to point out that certain post-positions refer to some 'hazy concepts'. Consider, for instance, the meaning of *ve:ṇṭi* in the following sentence as contrasted with its deletion.

19. (a) aya:ḷ vakki:liṉuve:ṇṭi paṇam koṭuttu

(b) aya:ḷ vakki:liṉə paṇam koṭuttu

In both (a) and (b) above, the money is being transferred from a certain person (*aya:ḷ*) to a certain lawyer (*vakki:l*). But the implication (or, at least the possibility) in 19 (a) is that the person has not directly handed over the money to the lawyer while in 19 (b) this extended implication is not explicit. 19 (a), therefore, could suggest that the money was entrusted with a third person with the understanding that the same would be passed to the lawyer. Hence, in verbs denoting the meaning 'give' the direct receiver and the beneficiary are differentiated, the latter being specifically referred to by the use of the post-position *ve:ṇṭi*. The distinction becomes more clear, when we examine sentences containing verbs other than 'give'. Examine the following sentences :

20. ña:n niṉakkuve:ṇṭi aviṭe po:ka:m

'I shall go there for your sake'

21. vaḷḷatto:ḷ śata:bdiya:gho:ṣattiṉuve:ṇṭi oru kammaṟṟi ru:pi:kariccu

'A committee was formed for the Vallathol Centenary celebration'

Notice the impossibility of a parallel construction to 20 :

20. (a) *ña:n ninakku aviṭe po:ka:m

However 21 can be expressed with no change in the meaning as below:

21. (a) vaḷḷatto:ḷ śata:bdiya:gho:ṣattinə oru kammaṟṟi ru:pi: kariccu

21. (a) suggests that inanimate objects can always be the beneficiary and not the actual receiver and therefore the overt expressson of the distinction becomes irrelevant in such cases. That is why 22(a) and (b) below are both possible with no difference in their implications:

22. (a) teraññeṭuppinə paṇam koṭuttu

(b) teraññeṭuppinuve:ṇṭi paṇam koṭuttu
'gave money for the election'

3.5. Yet another subtle difference of meaning is found in the case of the usage of the post-position, *veccə*. The two expressions below exemplify our point:

23. (a) ña:n sṭe:ṣanil avane kaṇṭu

(b) ña:n sṭe:ṣanilveccə avane kaṇṭu

Here, the difference of the meanings seems to be based on the reference to the perceiver's presence at the location of the object. 23 (b), in addition to the perceiver's visual contact with the object (here, *avan*), suggests that the event took place when the perceiver was present at the location. In other words, *ña:n* was present at the station during the event (seeing) referred to by the expression. 23 (a) does not specify the location of the perceiver at the time of 'seeing'. The impossibility of expressions like 24 and 25 below, confirms our supposition:

24. *ña:n fo:ṭṭo:vilveccə avaḷe kaṇṭiṭṭuṇṭə

25. *adde:ham hoṭṭalilveccə ta:masiccu

The fact that 'I' cannot be inside the photo at the time of my seeing 'her' in (24), and also the fact that 'he' cannot be elsewhere when his stay in the hotel is specifically mentioned (in 25),

rule out the acceptability of the above two sentences. Interestingly, this distinction is not found in Modern Tamil, although Tinneveley and Kanyakumari dialects (and also Ceylon Tamil) have this contrast.

4. Conclusion

The foregoing discussion leads us to the following conclusions:

1. the treatments of post-positions in Malayalam grammars are inadequate;
2. functionally, post-positions belong to a category in between independent words and dependent affixes;
3. post-positions are to be differentiated from auxilary verbs and the non-initial components of compounds;
4. post-positions do not change the category-function of the base forms with which they co-occur;
5. post-positions are predominantly noun-dependent elements;
6. on the basis of the combinatory possibilities, post-positions can be said to belong to two classes, namely, 'restricted' and 'non-restricted'; and
7. the semantics of Malayalam post-positions reveal several interesting features hitherto unnoticed.

five

The Expression of 'Direction'

0. Among Dravidian languages, Malayalam alone seems to be expressing the meaning of 'direction' by a variety of suffixations. In other Dravidian languages the directive sense is normally expressed by the dative case marker. Here, we are examining whether a separative 'directive case' can be set up in Malayalam.

1. The vernacular grammars consider the 'directive' as one of the many meanings which could be expressed by the dative itself or, by a compound case (Gundert, 1962: 132; Matthen 1969: 71; Rajaraja Varma, 1974: 190). Only L. V. Ramaswami Aiyyar (1936: 14) deals with nominal inflections having

directive sense separately. He does not, however, explicitly mention it as a special case.

2. Fillmore (1968 : 25) includes directive in locatives : 'Locative (L) is the case which identifies the location, or spatial orientation of the state or action identified by the verb'. He further states that, 'the list of cases includes L but nothing corresponding to what might be called directional. There is a certain amount of evidence, as was mentioned above, that locational and directional elements do not contrast but are superficial differences determined either by the constituent structure or, the character of the associated verb' (*ibid*: 25). It is true that in many languages directives are not markedly differentiated on the surface level. But we hope to show that directional expressions in Malayalam require a different treatment.

3. The expression of 'direction' in Malayalam takes various shapes as follows :

I. A. *-il* (with all nouns)

B. -the oblique base (with -m and -ṭ ending nouns)

C: *-e:kkə* (with type I.B. nouns and with locational nouns)

II. *-kkə* (with nouns ending in front vowels and r)

III. *-ile:kkə* (with all nouns)

IV. *-o:ṭṭə* (with 'directional' and 'locational' nouns)

V. Stress in the ultimate syllable (with vowel ending nouns)

(for illustrations see the appendix.)

There may be slight dialectal variations in regard to the above classification but the general pattern seems to be the same.

4. Rajaraja Varma (*op. cit.* Sutra : 71 and its interpretation) considers—*ile:kkə* forms as compound cases of locative and dative explaining the addition of vowel *e:* as euphonic. According to him—*o:ṭṭə* could be connected to *peṭṭə* (the verbal participle of *peṭu*) (*op. cit.* Sutra: 73). Ramaswami Aiyyar (*op. cit*: 16) has

expressed the same opinion with regard to—*o:ṭṭə*. Gundert (*op. cit:* 152) considers 'direction' as the primary or basic meaning of the dative case.

5. It will be clear from the above that Malayalam grammars have not adequately explained the various manifestations of 'direction' in the language. The arguments in support of considering the directive marker as a separate inflectional category are as follows:

(1) The distributions of the dative marker in its 'non-directive' sense are different from its distributions in the 'directive' meaning.

(2) The locative marker appears in the directive sense only with motion-verbs:

1. avar vi:ṭṭ–il po:yi
   'They went to the house'
2. iviṭeninnə ko:ḷe:j–ile:kkə etra du:ram uṇṭə?
   'How much is the distance from here to the college'

but not,

2. (a) *iviṭeninnə ko:ḷe:j–il etra du:ram uṇṭə

In the case of motion-verb *naṭakkə* 'walk' the locative marker cannot express the directive meaning. This is because *naṭakk*-has a non-motional meaning, 'happen'. Hence,

3. tiruvanantapurattə naṭannu
   'It happened at Trivandrum' and also, '(someone) walked in Trivandrum (city)'

contrasts with,

4. tiruvanantapuratte:kkə naṭannu
   '(Some one) walked to Trivandrum'.

The same applies to the verb *o:ṭ*–also but here the reason is not clear.

(3) *–o:ṭṭə* can never be included either with locative or with dative as it has only directional meaning.

6. Many of our casal constructions overlap with one another and therefore at first look they may seem to defy neat classification. This difficulty could be overcome to a very great extent if a detailed semantic classification of verbs is carried out as most of the mutual dependencies of grammatical categories are based on the characteristics of verbs.

APPENDIX

I. A. (i) aṭutta ma:sam niññaḷ na:ṭṭil pokunnuṇṭo: ?
'Are you going to (your) native place next month?'.

(ii) avar madra:sil cennə ranṭu divasam ta:masiccu
'They went to Madras and stayed (there) for two days'.

(iii) a:lappuḻayil po:ya:l adde:hatte ka:ṇa:m
'If (you) go to Alleppey you can see him'.

B. (i) innale ra:tri mukhyamantri kollattə vannappo:ḷ......
'When Chief Minister came to Quilon yesterday night......'

(ii) avaḷe ka:ṇa:n enikkə ko:ḻikko:ṭṭə onnu po:kaṇam
'I have to go to Kozhikode to see her'.

C. *kollatte:kkə po:yi* 'went to Kollam (Quilon)' and *pa:lakka:ṭṭe:kkə po:yi* 'went to Palghat' are possible but nouns other than the place names cannot be operated with this rule. For example, **kuḷatte:kkə po:yi* 'went to tank' and **ka:ṭṭe:kkə po:yi* 'went to forest' are impossible. Examples for locational nouns: *ni: aviṭe:kkə po:yo:* 'Did you go there?'; *avano:ṭə iviṭe:kkə vara:n parayu* 'Tell him to come here'.

II. (i) innə cantakkə po:kunnille:
'Aren't (you) going to the market today?'

(ii) i: bassə guruva:yu:rkkə po:kumo:
'Will this bus go to Guruvayoor?'

III. vi:ṭṭile:kkə 'to the house', kocciyile:kkə 'to Kocci (Cochin)', kuḷattile:kkə 'to the tank', etc. etc. (However, there are some rare exceptions like *pa:ṭattile:kkə 'to the field', *bha:gattile:kkə 'to the side', etc.)

IV. (i) puḷa tekko:ṭṭə oḷukunnu'
'The river flows southwards'

(ii) avaḷ eṅṅo:ṭṭə po:yi
'Where did she go?'

V: Contrast the construction *bo:mbe po:yi* 'Bombay went' with *bo:mbė po:yi* 'went to Bomba y' In *-a* ending nouns *a>e*, as *kaṭe poyi* 'went to the shop'.

six

The Expression of 'Path'

1. Among the case relationships, there seems to be a more or less closed set, the members of which appear to interrelate with one another rather systematically. The set consists of the following four cases: Location, Source, Path, and Direction. All these four cases signify certain relationships along the spatial parameter and therefore, could be conveniently labelled as 'spatial expressions'. In Malayalam the inclusiveness of these four casal relationships is reflected in the surface forms also. The locative case marker is *-il* and the other three casal formations are morphologically complex constructions, in that, for each, a specific secondary marker is added to the locative stem: *muri-(y) ilninnə* 'from the room' (source), *muri(y)-ilu:ṭe* 'through the room'

(path), and *muri(y)-ile:kkə* 'to the room' (direction). That all spatial expressions subsume the notion of location has already been noted by others (Bennett, 1972). A common feature of spatial expressions is that all of them can associate themselves with 'movement verbs' although the strength of associations vary among them. Location and movement verbs are weakly associated; source and direction are strongly linked with movement verbs; and path should necessarily have movement verbs for its realization. We shall be concerned in the following sections with the nature of 'path' and its specific manifestations in Malayalam.

2. There is no need to defend the independent status of 'path' as a distinct case since others have already accomplished it quite convincingly. Our task, therefore, would be to point out certain peculiar semantic and syntactic behaviours of the deep case 'path' in Malayalam. As mentioned before, path typically takes movement verbs as its predicators:

1. ka:la:ḷppaṭa marubhu:miyilu:ṭe muṉṉe:ṟikkoṇṭirikkunnu
   'The infantry is advancing through the desert'

2. ra:jan vara:ntayilu:ṭe naṭannu
   'Rajan walked along the corridor'

In the above sentences, *marubhu:mi* 'desert' and *vara:nta* 'corridor' show path-relation with the respective verbs. However, the surface expression *-ilu:ṭe* does not always show a path-relation in Malayalam. Consider the following sentences:

3. ña:n jaṉalilu:ṭe avaḷe kaṇṭu
   'I saw her through the window'

4. sukuma:ran fo:ṇilu:ṭe eṉṉo:ṭə samsa:riccu
   'Sukumaran spoke to me through the phone'

5. ña:n avaḷilu:ṭe a: rahasyam aṟiññu
   'I knew the secret through her'

6. patraññaḷilu:ṭe prasiddhappeṭuttiya a: va:rtta adde:ham niṣe:dhiccu
   'He denied that news which got published through the newspapers'

Apparently, none of the predicators in (3–6) refers to spatial dislocation. Some scholars have considered 'look' and 'see' as verbs of motion (Gruber, 1967). There are others who claim that the notion of movement should be divided into two as (1) concrete and (2) abstract. Concrete movement refers to the dislocation of a 'concrete object' towards a 'physically definable point'. Abstract movement can be defined as either 'change of possessorship' or 'change of condition' (Ikegami, 1973). In 'spatial expressions' we include only the concrete movement. How can we decide whether a verb belongs to the class known as 'movement verbs', or not? If any of the objects represented by an NP in a proposition shows a dislocation as a direct result of the activity denoted by the verb, the verb thus explicitly expressed could be considered as having the semantic feature 'plus movement'. In the above, two conditions, are specified for considering a verb as having the feature 'movement'. The object which suffers dislocation should have overt representation in the sentence through an NP and the dislocation should be causally related to the activity denoted by the verb. Let us examine sentences (3–6) to determine whether the concerned verbs qualify to be conceived as movement verbs. In (3) none of the three NPs—*ña:n* 'I' *jaṉal* 'window' and *avaḷ* 'she'—suffers dislocation. In (4) also the same argument holds good. But in (5) we might suppose that *rahasyam* 'secret' has moved from a non-specified source to *ñan* 'I'. But this spatial displacement is not caused by the activity indicated by the verb *aṟiy* 'know' in the sentence. In (6) also, there is no displacement of objects. Let us examine another sentence the interpretation of which brings out our case more clearly:

7. John sent a packet to George through an errand boy.

Obviously, in the above proposition the 'packet' has moved from 'John' to 'George'. One might be tempted to claim that the dislocation of the object 'packet is caused by the activity of John expressed by the verb 'send'. But a closer scrutiny would reveal that the movement of the packet is really due to the movement of the errand boy and not due to John's activity. Since there is no mention of the errand boy's movement in the

proposition, the sentence does not contain a movement verb. Therefore, the deep case relationship, that is manifested by the surface marker—*ilu:ṭe* in the above sentences (3–6), is that what could be called 'mediation'. The two notions 'path' and 'mediation' are in complementation in respect to their co-occurrence privileges with the verbs. 'Path' entails movement verbs whereas 'mediation' presupposes non-movement verbs.

3. Among spatial expressions, only path is typically inanimate. The others—location, source and direction—can often co-occur with animate nouns as shown below:

8. a: prasta:vana jananñaḷil amparappə uṇṭa:kki (location)
'That statement created anxiety among people'

9. avanilninnə eni:kkə onnum kiṭṭa:nilla (source)
'I have nothing to get from him'

10. paṭṭi atinte yajama:nante aṭutte:kkə o:ṭi (direction)
'The dog ran to its master'

Sentence (10) may appear to be a case of inanimate noun co-occurring with direction. But the specification of a spatial location in Malayalam sentences along with non-spatial nouns seems to be a surface constraint. The English equivalent of the same sentence supports this assumption. With certain verbs the directional suffix can however be added to non-spatial nouns:

11. ente śraddha avaḷile:kkə tiriññu
'My attention turned towards her'

Sentences of the following type may appear to be contradicting the postulated requirement.

12. sva:miji jananñaḷkkiṭayilu:ṭe kaiku:ppikkoṇṭə naṭannu
'Hands folded, Swamiji walked along the crowd'

Obviously, 'Swamiji' in the above sentence cannot walk through the people. The sense conveyed by the above sentence is, therefore, as follows: 'Swamiji walked through the place where people thronged'.

4. Both path and source share a unique privilege. They can occupy the object slots in sentences.

13. bassə pa:lam kaṭannu (pa:lattilu:ṭe)
'The bus crossed the bridge'

14. vima:ṉam oru maṇikkə bo:mbe viṭum (bo:mbeyilninnə)
'The plane will leave Bombay at 1 O'clock'

In the above, the verbs themselves contain the notion of the respective deep cases (path and source), and hence, the explicit expression of them by overt markers becomes redundant. In English a number of verbs allow path expressions being objectivized (Stratton, 1971 : 225). But in Malayalam only few verbs like *kaṭakkuka* 'cross' and *kaviyuka* 'overflow' allow objectivization of path. In the paper cited above the following sentence is given as an example of path occupying the surface object position:

15. Salmon swims the Columbia every spring.

The sentence cannot be translated by using the Malayalam equivalent for 'swim' (*ni:ntuka*). The Malayalam sentence would require the explicit expression of the notion of 'crossing' as seen below:

16. sa:lman ella: vasantattilum kolambiya:nadi ni:ntikkaṭakkum

5. Path can occur more than once in a simple clause:

17. vima:ṉam bañkaḷu:r kocci vaḷi tiruvaṉantapuratte:kkə paṟannu
'The plane flew to Trivandrum via Bangalore and Cochin'

The earlier assumption of case grammarians that the same deep case cannot occur more than once in a simple predication (Fillmore, 1968) is being contested by many with counter instances. Fillmore reiterates this 'one instance-per-clause principle' in a later paper (Fillmore 1971 : 248) but seems to have some doubts in the principle when faced with conjoined phrases (Fillmore, 1972 : 13). It has already been demonstrated that instrument and path cases violate the above principle (Nilsen, 1973 and Stratton, 1971).

Furthermore, the locative also appears as phrasal conjunction, the necessary condition being that the conjoined expression should denote a 'successive narrowing down' of location as illustrated by the following sentence:

18. aya:ḷ pu:nto:ṭṭattil oru marattinṯe cuvaṭṭil irikkukaya:ṇə
'That man is sitting in the park under a tree'

If we accept the distinction between phrasal and sentential conjunctions (see Smith, 1969 and Lakoff & Peters 1969 for details), cases like Agent and Patient (probably others too) can occur more than once each in a simple clause. Such multiple occurrences of the same case can be analysed either as (N_1+N_2)-case or as (N_1)- case+(N_2)- case. If instrument path and location can have multiple manifestations in a simple clause, on what grounds can we deny the same interpretation for other cases?

6. In Malayalam path is expressed either by the complex case marker *-ilu:ṭe* (or,—*ilku:ṭi*) or, by the adverbial *vaḻiya:yi* (or, *vaḻi* in abbreviation):

19. (a) ja:tha meyin roḍilu:ṭe ni:ṅṅi
(b) ja:tha meyin ro:ḍilku:ṭi ni:ṅṅi
(c) ja:tha meyin ro:ḍə vaḻiya:yi ni:ṅṅi
(d) ja:tha meyin ro:ḍə vaḻi ni:ṅṅi
'The procession moved along the main-road'

The conjunction of path expressions within a simple sentence imposes certain restrictions. If more than one path expression are stringed together using the usual conjunctive particle *-um*, the total string will not necessarily give the meaning of successive points in a single route: The sentence below thus,

20. mukhyamantri kocciyilu:ṭe:yum baṅkaḷu:rilu:ṭe:yum delhikkə po:yi

would normally suggest that 'the chief minister took two routes to Delhi, one through Cochin, and the other through Bangalore'. The serial meaning can be brought forth only by converting the whole string into an appositive construction:

21. mukhyamantri kocci baṅkaḷu:r vaḻi delhikkə po:yi
'The Chief Minister went to Delhi via Cochin and Bangalore'

8. Traditional grammars have not recognized 'path' as a distinct case in Malayalam. We have shown that path has specific realizations in the language and has to be included as a separate case in Malayalam.

seven

Vocative and Genitive

0.1. In traditional grammars genitive expressions are considered as falling under casal constructions. But in respect of vocatives, the grammarians seem to be unsure about its status. 'Besides the above-mentioned seven cases, there is one more, the Vocative' (Rajaraja Varma, 1974 : 173). The very fact that the vocative is not included in the original list of cases in Malayalam by Rajaraja Varma indicates his misgivings about its casal status. Elsewhere, he also states that 'vocative need not be considered as a distinct case' (*ibid*: 176). He fails to mention corresponding 'ka:rakas' to vocative and genitive. Let us also recall that Tolkappiam has only made an equivocal statement on vocative expression. The first su:tra on cases in it runs as follows :

ve:ṟṟumai ta:me: e:ḻeṉa moḻipa
'Cases are said to be seven in number'

In the very next su:tra,

viḷikoḷvatankaṇ viḷiyo:ṭeṭṭe:
'Adding the vocative, which is used for calling, (the cases) are eight'

the inclusion of vocative among cases is stated separately. Instead of saying that there are altogether eight cases, the ancient Tamil grammarian speaks about 'seven plus one' cases in Tamil. Why? Does it not show that he was hesitant to give vocative the same status as that of other cases?

0.2. It will be argued below that both vocative and genitive do not show 'ka:raka' relationships and hence should not be considered as casal constructions.

1.1. Vocatives can themselves appear as full sentences. In an utterance such as,

1. sa:ṟe: 'sir!'

the vocative nominal does not require the presence of a verbal predicate for the completion of its intention, viz. 'calling the attention of someone'. The only possibility of an expansion, 'I (speaker) call you (sir)', is obviously an absurd interpretation.

1.2. If vocatives independently function as full utterances, it cannot be a constituent of a sentential structure. It is true that more often than otherwise vocatives occur along with sentences. Thus (2) below,

2. uṇṇi:, iviṭe varu
'Unni, (please) come here'

may appear to act as a single utterance but the appearance is deceptive. In the above imperative sentence the agentive nominal is absent which can, however, be expressed overtly:

3. uṇṇi:, ni: iviṭe varu
'Unni, you (please) come here

Since both 'uṇṇi' and 'ni:' are co-referential nominals without being conjoined, the above structure cannot be taken as a simple sentence. Consequently, the vocative should be taken as a unit which lies outside the sentential structure and hence a peripheral constituent.

1.3. It is well-known that sentences in Dravidian languages do not exhibit a rigid word-order. Except nominal attributes and certain other function words, the lexemes do not have fixed preferential positions in sentences. Examine the following:

4. (a) ña:n innale si̱nimaykkə po:yi
   (b) innale ña:n si̱nimaykkə po:yi
   (c) innale si̱nimaykkə ña:n po:yi
   (d) ña:n si̱nimaykkə innale po:yi
   'I went to(a) movie yesterday'

Vocatives do not seem to have this freedom of word-order. They normally occur either before a sentence or after it. The appearance of vocatives in the middle produces odd structures as seen below:

5. (a)? ni: uṇṇi iviṭe varu
   (b)? ni: iviṭe uṇṇi varu

In cases where vocatives apparently appear intersentially, as in (6) below, it should be taken as a parenthesis:

6. e̱nikkə, kuññe:, ti:re vayya
   'for me—child (voc)—absolutely—not able'
   'Absolutely, I can't, (my) child!'

1.4. Vocatives, therefore, belong to a type of 'minor sentences' which also include others like ellipsis and 'interjections'. They differ from elliptical sentences in that the latter can be expanded to full structures while vocatives have no such expanded forms. They differ from interjections in that the latter are not morphologically marked while in many cases the vocatives have distinct markers. (For further details see section on 'vocal segregates' in this volume).

2.1. All our earlier grammarians have included genitives among cases. Rajaraja Varma states that 'the meaning of genitive is the relationship between nouns' (*op. cit:* 186). If genitives can express *only relationships* between two nominals they cannot be called casal expressions. Matthan has explicitly noted this peculiarity when he stated: "......the rest of the cases have the characteristics of verb-dependence. But the sixth case (*ṣaṣṭhi*) has the feature of noun-dependence" (Matthan, 1969 : 77). Among Malayalam grammarians only Gundert openly states that genitives cannot claim the casal status. He states: "*ṣaṣṭhi* does not belong to cases. In one sense, it can be considered as a compound......The reason for saying this is that, in Malayalam *ṣaṣṭhi* is not dependent on a verb" (Gundert, 1962 : 162). Yet Gundert has not excluded genitive from the discussion of cases in his grammar.

2.2. Malayalam grammarians seem to have been *misled* by the existence of the *sixth* case *in* Sanskrit which shows a '*ka:raka*' *as well as an attributive* relationship in that language. According to Panini, *ṣaṣṭhi vibhakti* has *sampradaːṉa kaːraka* (That which is approached by the agent through *its action* is *sampradaːṉa*). But the Sanskrit grammarian has also pointed out that *ṣaśṭhi*-constructions can also indicate non-'ka:raka' relationship. Therefore, the situation in Sanskrit is that the same surface form in different constructions can show different underlying relations, one casal and other non-casal in the above *instance*. This peculiarity warrants its *inclusion* among cases, as far Sanskrit is *concerned. The situation* in Malayalam is different. In our language, genitive has always the attributive function and hence it is to be analysed as a sub-class of *nominal* attributes (see section on 'nominal attributes' in this volume).

2.3. No casal form in Malayalam can generate a derived nominal meaning 'that which is NOUN+CASE'. Genitives allow this process:

7. (a) eṉṯe>eṉṯe:tə
   'my' –'that *which is* mine'
   (b) kuṭṭikaḷuṭe>kuṭṭtkaḷuṭe:tə
   'children's –'*that which* belongs to children'

8. (a) e̲nikkə>*e̲nikkaṭə
'I' (dative)

(b) jan̲aṅṅaḷe>*jan̲aṅṅaḷe:tə
'people' (accusative)

(c) vi:ṭṭil>*vi:ṭṭilatə
'house' (locative)

The above nominalization is a common feature of a majority of attributives in Malayalam. This commonness of behaviour indicates that genitives have attributive rather than casal function.

2.4. A noteworthy feature of genitive phrases is the non-specificity of their meanings. In one sense, this is true of all attributes. (This has already been noted in the section on 'nominal attributes' in this volume).

eight

Li:la:tilakam on Case

1. In dealing with Li:la:tilakam's (hereafter, L) treatment of Malayalam cases, two points have to be borne in mind. First, the case analysis presented in L is not exhaustive, the brevity conspicuously presenting a picture of ostensible superfluousness. Second, the analysis does not reflect a discrete and determinable design, making it virtually impossible for us to evaluate L's observations methodically. The whole description consists of four s:utras (22–25) out of which the last three specifically refer to the deletions of case-markers in certain morphological and syntactic combinations. Thus, our main concern is su:tra 22 which states that there are eight cases, namely, '*pe:r*', *e*, *oṭu*, *kku*, *niṉṟu*, *ṉṉu*, *il* and '*viḷi*'. Among these the first and last refer to the

respective case-relations by name, and the other six list the markers for the remaining case-forms. Obviously, one would be tempted to think that L has followed Tolka:ppiyam in formulating the introductory su:tra on cases, because the similarity is too explicit to be considered accidental.[1]

2. In listing the declensional categories, the early Dravidian grammars generally follow the Pa:ninian nomenclature. Pa:nini names the Sanskrit cases by merely assigning serial numbers to them as first case, second case, third case, etc. This system of naming has been followed by most of our traditional grammarians.[2] There ends their indebtedness to Pa:nini! While Pa:nini carefully distinguishes 'case function' (*ka:raka*) from 'case form, (*vibhakti*), our grammarians are seen struggling to give meanings to various case forms.[3] In listing the cases, the ancient grammars invariably list the case markers except for nominative and vocative. This deviation must have been felt necessary because nominative is unmarked and the markers for vocative do not have a base form.

3. After introducing the Malayalam case markers in su:tra 22, L goes on to deal with individnal 'cases' in the commentary that follows. We shall examine them one by one below:

4. **First Case:** L states that nouns appearing in the first case have their respective *pra:tipadika:rttha*. Pa:nini has stated that '*prathama:vibhakti*' shows the meaning of the unmodified nominal base.[4] The case, which all traditional grammars have referred to as '*prathama*' (nominative) or 'unmarked', has, in fact, not been explained semantically by anyone including Pa:nini.[5] Further, recent studies on case grammar have demonstrated that nouns having different casal functions can appear as subjects of sentences, there being a hierarchical order of preference in subject selection (Fillmore, 1968 and 1971). This shows that nouns in the nominative, even they appear as subjects, need not always retain their '*pra:tipadika:rttha*' as claimed by Pa:nini and his followers.

5. **Second Case:** L's statement, that *-e* is the marker for second case and *-ai* is the corresponding marker in Tamil, is significant as it indicates that both these markers were prevalent

in that period at least in certain types of literary compositions, if not in spoken dialects. Kunjan Pillai comments that during fourteenth century, *-ai* was being used as the marker for second case in the dialect of the local people (Kunjan Pillai, 1958:136f).[6] He further adds that *-ai* was completely replaced by *-e* only a century after. L points out that the second case will represent the object having the meanings, '*nirvartya*', '*vika:rya*' or '*pra:pya*'.[7] He does not elucidate the meanings of the terms. While in Sanskrit '*gra:mam a:vasantah*' is acceptable, L does not approve of the same structure in Malayalam But his implicit approval of the second case to denote directional sense raises problems. In no time in the history of Malayalam language such a concession has been tolerated. Strictly speaking, the directional meaning should be considered as a separate 'ka:raka' and in modern Malayalam this underlying relationship has distinct surface manifestations (See chapter on "Expression of Direction" in this work).

6. **Third Case**: There are three surface markers for third case, viz. *-oṭu*, *-a:l* and *-koṇṭu*. One might wonder why L has chosen the form *-oṭu* containing the short vowel when there is an alternant *-o:ṭu*. Does it mean that, according to L, *-oṭu* is the basic form and the other only a free variant? Facts speak against such a possible supposition. Even in the verses cited in L, the form with the long vowel appears more frequently than the other.[8] But it could be argued that forms with the elongated vowel was used in verses to meet the metrical contingencies. This contention cannot be upheld because of the following reasons: (1) If *-oṭu* was in vogue in the non-literary language as the dominant of the two variants, why did it not survive till today? In modern Malayalam we have only *-o:ṭu*, the other form (with the short vowel) being used only in the language of poetry for metrical purposes. (2) In '*bha:ṣa:kauṭali:yam*', a thirteenth century prose work, both forms occur.[9] L seems to have been influenced by the Tolka:ppiyam su:tra which gives *-oṭu* as the marker for the third case. The third marker, which L mentions, viz. *koṇ:ṭu*, cannot be treated as a case suffix. It is a verbal post-form which can occur as post-position after nominals. L does not care to indicate the meanings of the third case. Such an enquiry would

have entangled the author of L in complicated problems because this casal form covers a wide range of senses in Malayalam.[10] Further, the '*-e-koṇṭu*'—construction can never be grouped with the sociative *-o:ṭu* as it always denotes 'instrumentality'. One more of L's observations in this context invites comment. The vowel appearing between the nominal stems and the post-form *koṇṭu* is an 'empty morph', and not the second case marker, according to L. It is difficult to accept this argument, presented in the most casual and prescriptive manner with absolutely no attempt to support it with relevant evidences. If *-e-* in the aforementioned forms is an empty morph or inflectional increment, it should either appear in all forms or in certain statable phonological environments. Instead, we find that *-e-* is dropped only after inanimate nouns and this environment is not phonological. The second case marker is also dropped after inanimate nouns.[11] Therefore, there is no reason to consider *-e-* in these contexts as anything other than the objective case marker.

7. **Fourth Case**: We are told that there are three suffixes for the fourth case: *-kku*, *-aṉṉu*, and *-iṉṉu*. Here also, the author of the treatise appears to be blissfully unaware of facts. The illustrative words, which, he has provided for the latter two forms—*avaṉṉu*, *atiṉṉu* and *ivariṉṉu*—themselves speak against his segmentation.[12] He further remarks that these three forms can be followed by *a:yikkoṇṭu*. One wonders why such a superfluous statement has been made by him as there are many other post-forms which can be stringed to dative bases.[13] Also, nowhere else he has specified the privileges of collocations of post-forms with casal bases.

8. **Fifth Case**: The su:tra mentions *niṉṟu* as the fifth case ending, and in the commentary this case has been illustrated with the following examples: *marattil niṉṟu*, *marattiṉme:l niṉṟu*, *maratte:l niṉṟu*, *avan pakkal niṉṟu* and *avaḷ pakkal niṉṟu*. Comparative constructions like *kamalattekka:ṭṭil mukhamalakitu* have also been identified as fifth case expressions. If we take note of his earlier proposal that *-e-* in *avaṉekkoṇṭə* should be considered as an empty morph and not as a second case ending, we would be compelled

to call *-il* (before *ninru*) and *-e* (before *ka:ṭṭil*) empty morphs here also. But the author does not commit himself openly in favour of that interpretation although he suggests that 'here also, the increments are to be understood by the readers'! Both the above expressions do not belong to simple casal constructions, *ninru* and *ka:ṭṭil* being post-forms appearing after locative and accusative bases respectively.

9. **Sixth Case**: Besides *-nnu* mentioned in the su:tra as the sixth case ending, four more forms are listed in the commentary: *-kku*, *-iṭe*, *-eṭe* and *-ṟe*. A cursory glance through the cited verses in the grammar, however, revealed that *-uṭe* is predominantly used as the sixth case ending.[14] As far as genitive is concerned, inflectional construction seems to be not commonly favoured by poets; instead, genitival relationships are usually expressed periphrastically.[15] Sanskrit *ṣaṣṭhi vibhakti* forms as *tatsamas* were also freely used in 'maṇipravaːḷa' compositions. *-iṭe* and *-eṭe* in the above can be taken only as dialectal variants.

10. **Seventh Case**: The su:tra gives *-il* as the locative case marker but in the commentary, four more suffixes are mentioned, viz. *-ile*, *-me:l*, *-kal* and *pakkal*. Among these four, only *-kal* can be taken as a case ending as such; *-ile* being a composite form (*il*+*e*), and *me:l* and *pakkal*, post-forms. Therefore, we are left with only *-il* and *-kal*. These two have inessive and adessive meanings respectively, although *-il* very often is used nonspecifically, denoting general locational meaning.

11. **Eighth Case**: Words in this case end in the following vowels: *a:*, *i:*, *u:* and *e:*, so says L. What does this statement mean? L is too cautious to tell us that the above four vowels are the vocative case markers. Since L has only made a very superficial observation (too un-becoming of a grammarian!), we do not have to pause here to examine it. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that regarding vocative, the language of the west-coast appears to have had a tradition distinct from Tamil. Nouns ending in *-a* invariably follow the rule, *-a*>*-e:* in vocative transformations. L provides numerous examples in the exemplifying verses quoted in the text.[16]

12. **The Other Three Su:tras (23–25)**: As stated above, the remaining three su:tras in L speak about the deletions of sixth and seventh case endings in compounds, and the second case ending in sentences when the nouns denote inanimate objects or animals. The examples for the disappearance of sixth and seventh case markers in compounds are *puliva:l* (sixth case), *kaṭala:n̲a, malayiñci* (seventh case). At the first blush, these seem to be presenting an apparently convincing case. But the deceptive appearances wither away as soon as we attempt to probe further. The sixth-case deletion does not present problems as *puliva:l* and *ma:nto:l* can naturally be expanded to their corresponding phrasal structures, viz. *puliyuṭe va:l* and *ma:n̲in̲ṭe to:l* respectively. The examples for seventh-case deletions do not submit themselves to such phrasal expansions: *katala:n̲a—kaṭalil uḷḷa a:n̲a* (?), *malayiñci —malayil uḷḷa iñci* (?). 'Native intuition' (how successfully the term saves us from certain difficult situations!) informs that *kaṭala:n̲a* and *kaṭalil uḷḷa a:n̲a* are not semantically equivalent. Since this topic is not immediately relevant to L, we shall not discuss that any further here. (But see chapter on 'A unique phrasal construction').

Conclusion: The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in which two works of historical importance were supposed to have been composed, viz. "bha:ṣa: kauṭali:yam" (13th C) and "li:la:tilakam" (14th C), belong to a crucial period as far as the evolution of Malayalam is concerned. This period can be called the 'transitional stage' of the formation of Malayalam since this was the period when the foundations of contemporary Malayalam were laid. There is no single rectilinear continuity between the linguistic situation of the pre-transitional stage and that of the mid-fifteenth century. It appears that a number of varied socio-cultural factors activated the process of the emergence of Modern Malayalam during these centuries.

Since L made its appearance in this crucial period, its importance as a source-material for reconstructing the linguistic phylogeny of the west-coast, should not be underestimated. Yet, too much reliance on L's analysis of the language habits of its period is

likely to blur the visions of language historians. L pleads eloquently for the recognition of the 'lingua franca' of the west-coast as a variety of vernacular clearly distinct from its immediately neighbouring counterpart, that is, the language of the Tamil country. He attempts to accomplish this by indulging in an unrefined kind of logical argumentation, garbed in a verbose style which often presents itself as verbal acrobatism.

His scanty treatment of the grammatical topics, as we have seen above in regard to Malayalam declensions, is devoid of originality. His allegiances to ancestral minds are unquestionably explicit. To use a metaphor to describe his methodology in grammar, 'an assortment of ingredients have been put into the pot; they have not been properly cooked'. No concrete effort is made anywhere in the treatise to reveal his theoretical assumptions. A Malayalam scholar has correctly assessed this work in the following words (translation mine); "In short, the author of L doesn't exhibit those qualities which a grammarian should essentially possess, namely, the ability for critical analysis and objective presentation of facts. We are not meeting a person here who had extensive mastery of 'ke:raḷa bha:ṣa'. Instead, we are facing a traditional grammarian who was well in touch with 'centamiḻ' and Sanskrit. He does not treat Malayalam grammar factually. He seems to be expecting that his rules will be followed by the language.........therefore, it will be dangerous to rely solely on the analysis of the language found in L for understanding the nature of fourteenth century Malayalam" (Velayudhan Pillai, 1968;39).

NOTES :

1. Kunjan Pillai thinks that L leans on Nannu:l rather than Tolka:ppiyam. This is not true. He quotes (Kunjan Pillai, 1958: 136f) a Tolka:ppiyam su:tra which appears in 'punariyal' (section on sandhi). The su:tra which should be considered is the one which appears in 've:rrumaiyiyal' (section on case), viz., 'avaita:m peyar ai oṭu ku in atu kaṇ viḻiyennum i:rra' (Tol. Col. 64).

2. Rajaraja Varma (19th C.) however, disapproves of copying the Pa:ninian system of classification for describing the case system of Dravidian vernaculars. According to him, the Dravidian case system is different from the Sanskrit system of declension. He therefore, adopts a different approach to suit the needs of Malayalam language. Accordingly, he assigns appropriate names to Malayalam cases as follows: nirdde:śika (nominative), pratigra:hika (accusative), samyo:jıka (sociative), udde:śika (dative), prayo:jika (causal), sambandhika (possessive), a:dha:rika (locative) and sambo:dhika (vocative). (Rajaraja Varma, 1974: 170; 173).

3. Here also, Rajaraja Varma should be credited for having forseen the pitfalls that lie ahead in imitating other Dravidian grammars especially Tolka:ppiyam and Nannu:l. We are not, however, suggesting that his analysis of Malayalam cases is perfect.

4. 'pra:tipadika:rtthalingaparima:ṇa vacana ma:tre: prathama:' (Pa:nini).

5. Rajaraja Varma's explanation goes like this: 'tanma nirdde:śika: kartta:' meaning, that the 'nirdde:śika' (nominative) form will be the subject of sentence and retains the noun's original unmodified meaning. It must be pointed out that not all nouns in the nominative become the subjects, either grammatical, or logical, of sentences. For instance, in the following sentences the italicized items are in the nominative but they are not subjects of the respective sentences:

   (1) ña:n *i:śvara viśva:si*yalla
   'I am not a believer of God'.

   (2) innale ra:tri ña:n raṇṭə *maṇikku:r* va:yiccu
   'Yesternight, I read for two hours'.

   (3) ña:n divase:na na:lə *na:ḻika* naṭakkum
   'Daily I walk four miles'.

   (4) e: bi:ye *viva:ham* ceytu
   'A married B'.

6. He has elsewhere stated that during the time of L, the upper—class and lower-class dialects of the language of the west-coast showed some marked differences. The 'traivarṇikabha:ṣa' of the upper class was a 'miśrabha:ṣa' (mixed language). A pidgin-like lingua franca, which was a mixture of the local dialect of Tamil and the alien Sanskrit was favoured by the Aryan insurgents (the 'nampu:tiri' brahmins) as a

compromise between the conflicting linguistic affinities of the locals and themselves.

7. "Karma ka:raka subsumes three meaning relations according to the Pa:nini:yas, viz, nirvartya 'thing produced' as in the sentence, ghaṭam karo:ti 'he makes the pot', vika:rya 'thing affected' as in the sentence, ghaṭam bhinatti 'he breaks the pot', and pra:pya 'thing reached' as in the sentence, gra:mam gacchati 'he goes to the village'" (Ananthanarayana, 1970 : 22).

8. *The following are some instances:*

(1) 'Ka:mpo:ṭuku:ṭa maruvi:ṭuka manmatha:re:h' (14.91)

(2) 'ka:ṟṟo:ṭa:ṭum naṭuvu kulaykka:n mano: kanmano:jñam' (50.207)

(3) 'kunṟo:ṭokkum kucasarasijadvanda viśle:ṣabha:ja:m' (140.316)

(4) 'kandarppano:ṭu pakaya:m kuḷurtiṅkāḷ cu:ṭa:m' (158.332)

9. Ezhuttacchan states that the sociative marker –oṭu is used in 'bha:ṣa: kauṭali:yam' like today. When we glanced through the printed text edited by him, we spoted many instances of –o:ṭu also (Ezhuttacchan, 1960). It should also be mentioned that, short and long vowel allographs (e and o) were not differentiated in ancient manuscripts. In early Malayalam prose works, like 'brahama:ṇḍapura:ṇam', 'naḷo:pa:khya:nam', 'ambari:ṣo:pa:khya:nam', and 'du:tava:kyam', the sociative marker is uniformly –oṭu and not its contracted variety (Chandrasekhar, 1959 & 1969; Velayudhan Pillai, 1968).

10. For instance examine the following sentences:

(1) 'e: bi:yo:ṭə samsa:rikkunnu'
"A speaks to B"

(2) 'e:ye bi:yo:ṭə ta:ratamyappeṭutta:m'
"A can be compared with B"

(3) 'e: bi:yo:ṭə kalahiccu'
"A quarrelled with B"

(4) 'e: bi:yo:ṭə ce:rnnu'
"A joined B"

(5) 'e:kkə bi:yo:ṭə sne:han uṇṭə'
"A has love towards B"

11. See the following:

(1) 'avan oru to:kkə (*to:kkine) va:ṅṅi'
"He bought a gun"

(2) 'avan to:kkə (*tokkine)koṇṭə veṭi veecu'
"He shot with a gun".

12. Av(base)-an(mas. sg)-u (case)
at(base)-in (empty morph)-u (case)
ivar (base)-in (empty morph)-u (case)
(The doubling of n is optional here.)

13. Such as,

(I)	avaḷkkə ve:ṇṭi	'for her'
(2)	avaḷkkə ma:tram	'only for her'
(3)	avaḷkkə śe:ṣam	'after her'
(4)	avaḷkkə taṉṉe	'for herself'
(5)	avaḷkkə mumpe	'before her'

14. The following are some such usages:

(1) 'po:ra: puṇyaprasaramoruna:ḷennuṭe: vallabha:ya:h' (18.94)

(2) 'culala maruva:rute:co:ritan parimala' (45.203)

(3) 'na:na:vila:samoru na:yarute: kaḷatram' (123.292)

(4) 'pu:nte:npo:le madhuramaravinda:nane: ninnute: col ..pu:nte:n ta:num madhuramadhikam ninnute: collu po:le' (145.319)

(5) 'na:nancinre:nnni ninnute:ninavumenta:yuanritenra inne' (155. 329)

(6) 'pa:da:mguliyute: ha:sapadavi:va nakha:vali' (165.344)

(7) 'hrdayamapi koṭuttiṭṭennuṭe: vallabha:ya......'
'...kusumaśara, ninekko: ninnuṭe: nillaya:rkko:' (176.360)

(8) 'ka:ṇmeṅkilo: rahasi ka:ntayuṭe: vila:sam' (179.364)

15. ex: 'ka:ṇa:miraṇṭu tuṭatan naṭuve: karuttiṭṭ......' (53.211)

16. abale: (126.295), na:yike: (150.325), tanaye: (163.340), ni:liyamme: (185. 369) are some of them.

nine

A Unique Phrasal Construction

1. Among the various independent historical developments that had happened in Malayalam language, a peculiar type of nominal attributive construction deserves special attention. This phrasal unit is generated from a locative nominal base by adding a particle *-e*. The following are a few examples:

1. ka:ṭṭile a:ṉa — 'forest (wild) elephant'
2. kiṇaṟṟile veḷḷam — 'well-water'
3. ja:ppa:ṉile stri:kaḷ — 'Japanese women'
4. laibṟaṟiyile pustakaṅṅaḷ — 'library books'
5. ke:raḷattile mantrima:r — 'Kerala ministers'

In all the above, the first constituent is an omissable (and therefore dependent to the head constituent) member of the respective phrasal unit. These dependent units exhibit a syntagmatic function akin to the adjectives. The whole phrase containing this type of attribute and the head noun functions as a unitary constituent of a larger construction. The English equivalents given above may give an impression that the items listed are nominal compounds but they are not so, as they allow insertions of other attributes in between the two constituents as seen below:

3. (a) ja:ppa:ṉile ceṟuppakka:rikaḷa:ya stri:kaḷ
'young women of Japan'

5. (a) ke:raḷattile ko:ŋgrassuka:ra:ya mantrima:r
'Congress ministers of Kerala'

2. Gundert (1962 : 168), stating that locative nominals can sometimes function as nominatives also, considers this type as the corresponding sixth case formation. No doubt, Gundert recognises the attributive function of these forms. Nonetheless, he has not attempted to explicate the phenomenon further.

3. The credit for revealing the peculiarity of this type of phrasal unit in Malayalam should go to a native grammarian, George Matthan, a contemporary of Gundert, whose tiny grammar unfortunately failed to attract much attention from later linguists. The approaches of these two treatises differ in many respects. Gundert's grammar abounds with citations which indeed are valuable source materials for constructing the history of Malayalam language but his grammar lacks logical substantiation of the rules that have been incorporated, and, therefore falls short of expectations. Matthan, on the other hand, is not exhaustive in his treatment; yet he has made certain original observations and unique interpretations which are not found in the numerous Malayalam grammars that followed his work. According to Matthan, the principal difference between Gundert's and his (Matthan's) grammars "consists in the former being more 'dogmatical' and the latter more 'explanatory', in the one furnishing the student with the bare rules and the other

presenting him with the reasons together with the rules" (Matthan, 1969: 12). Matthan's claim is not unjustified as could be seen on a careful perusal of his work. One such observation which brings out the uniqueness of his grammar pertains to the construction under examination in this section.

4. Matthan contrasts the following two constructions,

6. ci:ṉattuḷḷa jaṉaṅṅaḷ

7. ci:ṉatte jaṉaṅṅaḷ

and states that, when the post-position *-uḷḷa* is added to a locative base, it shows container—content relationship; on the other hand, when the particle *-e* (which he connects to *a:ya*, the relative participle of the Malayalam copula) is appended to a locative base, it shows only object-space relationship. Citing the above expressions, he points out that (6) refers to 'only those who reside in China' but (7) can indicate 'Chinese people, even when they reside outside China' (Matthan, 1969: 144).

5. Matthan unequivocally brings out the semantic distinction between the two expressions. His contention, that the particle *-e* in (7) is a contracted form of *a:ya*, seems to be a far-fetched derivation because *a:ya*, being the past relative participle of the copula *a:ku* 'to be', cannot reveal a sense of 'belongingness' as in (7). Furthermore, expressions of the type (7) can be predicated with the copula *a:ku* as shown below:

8. itə kiṇaṟṟile veḷḷam a:kunnu
'This is well-water'

Still another difficulty is to explain the phonological change that results in the contraction of *a:ya* into *-e*.

6. Rajaraja Varma (1974) calls this type of phrasal construction 'pseudo-case' formations. According to him, in forms like *kiṇaṟṟile*, two casal markers (*-il* and *-e*) are added to the nominal stem and, therefore, such forms are examples of 'doubling of cases'. He, however, does not mention what case does *-e* represent here (pp. 179–180). Later (p. 281), he modifies

his earlier statement and remarks that all 'pseudo-case' formations have an attributive function.

7. Rajaraja Varma speaks about three types of 'pseudo-case' formations: (1) those which have restricted privileges of occurrence (ex: *-kal*, the locative marker meaning 'nearby', does not combine with plural nouns; even in the case of singular nouns, only a very few items accept this suffix—*paṭikkal* 'at the gate'; *va:tilkkal* 'at the door'; but not **muṟikkal* 'at the room'; **cantakkal* 'at the market'); (2) the casal stems without the overt case markers themselves exhibiting casal relationship (ex: *ka:latta* (loc) 'in the morning'; *pu:vin maṇam* (gen) 'flower's fragrance') and (3) forms where two case markers are sequentially conjoined and appended to the nominal stem (ex: *ka:ṭṭile*<*ka:ṭə*+*-il* (loc)+ *-e* (?) 'of the forest'). We are here concerned only with the last of the above three.

8. It is not correct to say that *-e* in *ka:ṭṭile* is a case marker. Since the addition of *-e* transforms the casal noun into a nominal attribute, *-e* is to be taken as an attributive sign. The appearance of this particle with attributive function is not infrequent in the language (see appendix).

9. Ramaswamy Aiyyar (1936) states: "From about the fifteenth century onwards, the texts show more or less frequently a unique Mal. phrasal unit in which the first constituent with a locative ending, followed by the particle *-e:*, stands in direct relationship to the *viśe:ṣya* that forms the second constituent of the phrasal unit. In this unique Mal. construction the particle *-e:* is annexed to the locative in order to convey the idea of a verb like *uḷḷa* which is not expressed; and the locative form (along with *-e:*) and the noun (or pronoun) following it together form a compound unit which may be declined" (p. 16).

10. Aiyyar seems to be not certain regarding the meaning of *-ile* forms. His remark that the particle *-e:* is added to the locative 'in order to convey the idea of a verb LIKE *uḷḷa*, does not speak much. Matthan has already pointed out the semantic contrast between the *-ile*—forms and *-iḷ-uḷḷa*—forms (see 4 above).

We shall examine a more concrete example here which will give credence to Matthan's observation. Pointing to two pots of water successively, it is possible to make the following statements:

9. i: pa:trattil kiṇaṟṟile veḷḷam a:ṇə
'This pot contains well-water'

10. a: pa:trattil puḷayile veḷḷam a:ṇə
'That pot contains river-water'

Notice that (11) and (12) below appear as odd sentences:

11. ? i: pa:trattil kiṇaṟṟiluḷḷa veḷḷam a:ṇə

12. ? a: pa:trattil puḷayiluḷḷa veḷḷam a:ṇə

The phrases *kiṇaṟṟiluḷḷa veḷḷam* and *puḷayiluḷḷa veḷḷam* convey the ideas 'water that exists in the well' and 'water that exists in the river' respectively, and, therefore, the apparent contradictions result in both (11) and (12). It is not the case that *-ile*—constructions cannot be used in the sense of 'existing'. Thus the ensuing sentences are semantically identical:

13. kiṇaṟṟile veḷḷam vaṟṟa:ṟa:yi
'The well-water is about to dry up'

14. kiṇaṟṟiluḷḷa veḷḷam vaṟṟa:ṟa:yi
'The water in the well is about to dry up'

Therefore, the *-ile*—constructions can convey the sense 'existing' but need not always do so.

11. In regard to the status of the particle *-e* appearing after locative bases and elsewhere, Aiyyar offers various proposals which can be summarized as follows: (a) The *-e:* in *kiṇaṟṟile:* (he takes this 'e' as long)—type formations can be traced to the Tamil *i:ṟṟasai* or terminative expletive (p. 18). Tolkappiar, in explaining the senses that can be conveyed by the particle *-e:*, states that in poems this elongated vowel can be added as a terminative expletive without any meaning whatsoever. (*Tolka:ppiam, collatika:ram* sutra: 257). (b) The final *-e:* occurring in certain other forms (adverbial, adjectival, and post-positional) is related

to the Tamil *-a* of infinitive participles with an intermediate stage when this corresponds to the centralized *-ə* (p. 79). (c) There is yet another *-e*: occuring after directives and 'local' words like *vaṭakke:*, *me:le*, *ki:ḻe:* etc., which is to be connected to the emphatic *-e*: corresponding to *te:ṯṟam e*: of Tamil (p. 110. for '*te:ṯṟam*' see *Nannu:l*, sutra: 354). (d) The particle *-e*: occuring in forms like *paṇṭe: tale:*, *piṟṟe:*, etc., has to be derived from the corresponding nominal ending of Tamil *-ai* as in *paṇṭai, talai, piṟṟai*, etc. (p. 109).

12. Aiyyar speaks about other functions of *-e*: also (restrictive, interrogative, vocative, interjectional, augument) but they are not relevant for our discussion here. As mentioned already (see 8 above), our inclination is to call all these occurrence of *-e*(:) an attributive marker. All the above instances of the appearance of *-e*: have only an attributive function. Synchronically, the *-e*: of all these forms is to be treated alike for reasons that follow: (1) It has a grammatical meaning and hence cannot be connected to the *i:ṟṟasai* of Tamil; (2) although some of the *-e*:'s could be derivationally related to the infinitives of earlier times, as Ramaswamy Aiyyar points out, the *-e*: of the forms that are referred to by Aiyyar in present-day language has no function similar to infinitives; (3) it is also difficult to consider this as an emphatic particle because in forms like *me:le, ki:ḻe*, etc. there is no sense of emphasis; (4) to say that the final ending of forms like *tale:*, *paṇṭe:*, etc. is related to the corresponding *-ai* of earlier times will amount to the acceptance of the nominal (not casal) ending *-ai* developing into *-a* and *-e*: separately in Malayaḷam.

13. It follows, then, that in all the forms listed in the appendix, the final *-e* is a particle denoting attributive function. One peculiarity of this *-e* is that it takes nouns as well as verbs as its heads demanding its designation as merely 'attributive' and not as 'adjectival' or 'adverbial'. The adjectival and adverbial functions of the particle *-e* are exemplified below:

adjectival:

15.	pirre: divasam	'next day'
16.	vaikunne:ratte ka:ppi	'evening coffee'
17.	kure pustakaṅṅaḷ	'many books'
18.	vaḷare a:ḷukaḷ	'many people'

adverbial:

19.	urakke samsa:riccu	'talked loudly'
20.	ne:re naṭannu	'walked straight'
21.	mumpe naṭanna sambhavaṅṅaḷ	'events that happened before'
22.	nanne kṣi:ṇiccu	'got extremely tired'

The attributes of (17) and (18) (and some others) are syntactically less bound than the rest (for further details see chapter on 'Nominal attributes.')

14. That *-ile*—constructions should not be called 'pseudo-casal' (as Rajaraja Varma and many others following him have called, including the author of a recent grammar—Kunnappally, 1976: 134), perhaps, requires further elucidation: (1) Nouns ending in case markers cannot be nominalized again, whereas adjectivals produce derived nominals by the addition of the neuter pronominal suffix. In this, the *-ile*—forms show similiarity to adjectives:

23.	nalla	nallatə
24.	ceriya	ceriyatə
25.	puḷayile	puḷayile:tə
26.	ra:vllatte	ra:vilatte:tə

(2) All case-ending nouns can be adjectivized by adding the post-position *uḷḷa*. This is not possible in the case of *-ile*—constructions:

27.	avaḷkkə (dat)	avaḷkkuḷḷa
28.	avaḷe (acc)	avaḷeyuḷḷa
29.	avaḷo:ṭə (soc)	avaḷo:ṭuḷḷa

30. avaḷa:l (cause) avaḷa:luḷḷa
31. avaḷil (loc) avaḷiluḷḷa
(simple cases)
32. avaḷile:kkə (dir) avaḷile:kkuḷḷa
33. avaḷilu:ṭe (med) avaḷilu:ṭeyuḷḷa
(complex cases)

(3) Another peculiarity of *-ile*—constructions concerns with the well-known 'one-instance-per-clause principle' proposed by Fillmore (1968) (see also Fillmore, 1971 for a reaffirmation of the validity of the principle; he is re-examining certain apparent counter-examples here; also Stratton, 1971 for cases where the principle seemingly fails to operate). The principle states that in a simple sentence a particular case can occur only once. If a specific case form is found occuring more than once in a sentence, either the sentence will have to be related to more than one source sentence, or, the superficially identical case forms actually would be referring to more than one case meaning. The phrasal unit under examination can occur more than once in a single predication as seen below:

34. i: no:val kocciyile teruvukaḷile piccakka:rekkuṛicca:ṇə
'This novel is about the beggars in the streets of Cochin'

(4) Yet another clue for the non-inclusion of *-ile*—constructions in casal or pseudo-casal constructions, is the impossibility of stringing certain post-positions to these forms while it is possible to do so in nouns ending in case signs:

35. eṉikkə ma:tram
'only for me'

36. a: kuṭṭikkə taṉṉe
'to that child itself'

37. avaṉe ma:tram
'only him'

38. makaṉe taṉṉe
'son (acc) himself'

39. kiṇaṟṟile veḷḷam ma:tram kuṭikkaṇam
'must drink well-water only'

40.* kiṇaṟṟile ma:tram veḷḷam kuṭikkaṇam

41. kiṇaṟṟile veḷḷam taṉṉe kuṭikkaṇam
'must drink the well-water itself'

42.* kiṇaṟṟile taṉṉe veḷḷam kuṭikkaṇam

15. This re-examination of the status of the *-ile*—constructions is felt necessary because the tradition set forth by Rajaraja Varma in his famous Malayalam grammar, *ke:raḷapa:ṇiṉi:yam* in considering this phrase as a pseudo-casal form still persists among native scholars. *ke:raḷapa:ṇiṉi:yam*, no doubt, is a masterly treatise but a substantive portion of the work needs revision in the light of recent developments in linguistic studies. His work was followed by numerous other grammars, most of which were produced to meet periodical exigencies confronted by the academic world. These later grammars, with the exception of, perhaps, Seshagiri Prabhu's *vya:karaṇamitram*, are faithful imitations of *ke:raḷapa:ṇiṉi:yam* bereft of originality either in the matter of analysis or in the matter of approach. It is because of this situation, that Rajaraja Varma's nineteenth century grammar, despite its being outdated, continues to enjoy dominance even today.

16. We shall now examine the problem of generating this phrase from an underlying source sentence. Transformationalists believe that attributive-noun constructions are derivationally related to deep-level sentences. The critics have questioned this view. Since *-ile*—constructions and *-il-uḷḷa*—constructions are semantically distinct expressions, in the transformational theory they are to be connected to two different source structures. Abraham (C.I.I.L., Mysore, in a personal communication) suggests that both phrases can be shown to be transformations of an underlying sentence containing an existential verb:

43. veḷḷam pulayil uṇṭə
> (a) pulayil uḷḷa veḷḷam
> (b) pulayile veḷḷam

According to him, the difference in the meanings can be attributed to the two senses of the existential verb *uṇṭə*. Abraham is right in pointing out that the verb *uṇṭə* need not necessarily indicate a 'location at a specified time', but can refer generally to a sense of 'belongingness' or 'association'. For instance, the sentence,

44. eṉṯe kla:ssil pattə vidya:rthikaḷ uṇṭə
'There are ten students in my class'

does not specify the presence of ten students in the class room at the time of the utterance, but suggests the fact that there are ten students who take the course along with 'me'. This interpretation apparently seems to be a satisfactory solution. We have, nonetheless, certain misgivings about this proposal. Our feeling is that the possible double interpretation is not due to the double senses of the verb *uṇṭə* but to the possibility of two different readings of the locational noun in the sentence. In (44) the noun 'class' can refer to either a particular space (class room) or to a particular occupation (course of study). Notice how the ambiguity disappears when 'class' is substituted with 'classroom':

45. eṉṯe kla:ssumuṟiyil pattə vidya:rthikaḷ uṇṭə
'There are ten students in my classroom'

Sentence (45) can have only one reading, that is, 'the physical location of ten students in the classroom'. Likewise, the following sentences do not allow extended interpretations:

46. puḷayil veḷḷam uṇṭə
'There is water in the river'

47. ceṭiyil pu:kkaḷ uṇṭə
'There are flowers in the plant'

It follows, then, that (46) and (47) cannot generate the phrases (48) and (49):

48. puḷayile veḷḷam

49. ceṭiyile pu:kkaḷ
(in the sense of belongingness)

The evidence presented here strengthens the existing suspicion regarding the validity of the adjective transformation.

17. In summary, the foregoing discussion leads us to the following: Malayalam has a peculiar grammatical process by which an adjective can be derived from a locative nominal by the addition of an attributive particle; this construction has the general meaning of 'belongingness'; this phrase cannot be shown to be derivationally related to an underlying predicated clause.

APPENDIX

Words ending with the attributive particle *-e* (not complete):

kuṛe	'many'	ne:re	'straight'
vaḷare	'many'	ta:ṉe	'alone'
uṛakke	'loudly'	puṛake	'after'
patukke	'slowly'	mumpe	'before'
ve:ṟe	'other'	ti:re	'completely'
piṛṛe	'next'	taḷe	'down'
tale	'preuious'	me:le	'up'
okke	'all'	akale	'distant'
a:ṛe	'much'	nanne	'extremely'
ca:re	'near'	naṭa:ṭe	'first time'
aṭukke	'near'	piṉṉe	'later'
to:ṉe (coll.)	'much'	aṅṅe	'of that place'
uyare	'high'	vaṭakke	'northern'
e:ke	'in total'	uṭane	'immediately'
veṛute	'merely'	parakke	'extensively'
neṭuke	'flatly'	kuṛuke	'across'

ten

Subjectless Sentences

0. That all sentences can broadly be divided into a subject-constituent and a predicate-constituent is a view which finds favour in traditional as well as modern grammatical analyses, although the specific criterion, by which such a division is to be made, has not been suggested uptill now. Superficially, the initial NP in a sentence of normal word order, which is directly related to the verb, is identified as its subject. The identification, however, fails to satisfy when more complex structures are examined: Of late, several arguments have been forthcoming for banishing the notion of 'subject' from consideration of deeper structures, despite the traditionalists' endeavour to hold their fort desperately in favour of keeping the elusive renegade within

its hereditary domain. We shall, in the section to follow, briefly refer to the present 'state of art' regarding the issue at hand.

1.1. None seems to have doubted the relevance of the notion of 'subject-category' in the surface-structure of sentences in European languages. It is in regard to its usefulness in the deep level that opinions differ. Thus we have two parallel categories, namely, the 'surface subject' and the 'deep subject' (the latter, sometimes, is called 'underlying subject' or 'logical subject'). For Chomsky (1965) it is in terms of the topology of the deep-structure phrase-marker that the semantically relevant (?) notions of subject, object and predicate are defined and selection-restrictions are accounted for. In his theory, a noun phrase immediately dominated by the node S will be called the deep subject. But it is the surface subject which is relevant to 'agreement'. In other words, the term deep subject refers to the NP argument that appears (or would appear) to the immediate left of the verb in surface-structure if no permutation transformation intervenes during the derivational process. There are, of course, sentences without the overt presence of surface subjects as in 'imperative' and certain 'embedded' constructions.

1.2. Fillmore (1968. a) presents the following arguments for discarding the role of subject from deep-structures: (i) The NPs appearing in the underlying structure are differentiated only on the basis of the various semantic roles that they manifest; the surface subjects may have a number of different roles. (ii) In the absence of an 'agent' in the deep sentence, another NP is moved to the front at the surface level and this NP occupies the position of subject. (iii) There is a 'subject-choice hierarchy' which determines what NPs may be made into subjects.

1.3. McCawley's (1970) main concern is to show that verbs are the pivotal constituents in the source structure, NPs cannot be differentiated on the basis of 'priority relationships' to the verbs, and as such, the underlying representations are not required to have the role of subject.

1.4. A strong refutation to the above two views comes from Lee (1971) in the following manner: (i) Fillmore has shown

ONLY that the deep agents have 'priority' over other roles to be the surface subjects; (ii) in passive sentences the 'by-phrase' would have to be considered as 'secondary subjects' and not all 'by-phrases' are deep agents. (ex: 'The thief was seen by John'. Here, 'John' is experiencer); (iii) If there is a subject-choice hierarchy, it is required to account for it on independent grounds; showing that agents are deep subjects is a first step in that direction; (iv) McCawley has shown that superficial non-agent subjects need not be deep subjects (in the course of his argument which is not mentioned earlier in the reference); this, according to Lee, confirms the view that only agents are deep subjects.

1.5. Lakoff and Ross (1976) in a brief and blunt remark state: "......'subject of' and 'object of' are not directly relevant for semantic interpretation......The subject and object......seem to have no semantic relevance, so why base a theory on them?" (p. 161).

1.6. The issue has become more complicated when fresh evidences from languages other than English were brought to light. Kuroda's (1965) 'exclusive' and 'descriptive' subjects, Fillmore's (1968) 'primary' and 'secondary' topicalizations (both in reference to Japanese), and Yang's (1971) 'double' subject (in Korean) shake the roots of the concept of subject even in the consideration of the surface-structure. The following observation by Yang summarizes the problem: "Here we see that the concept of 'subject' is very elusive and seems to be QUITE DIFFERENT DEPENDING ON LANGUAGES. And we see that it is hard to apply the concept of 'subject' of English directly into Korean, though we use the term 'subject' in both languages" (p. 233; emphasis ours). Schachter (1977) reports that in Philippine languages, the subject properties are represented by two constituents, TOPIC and ACTOR. Topic supposedly reveals 'referential prominence' compared to other nominals in the sentence. Actor, on the other hand, is the 'protoganist' or the individual who is viewed as being at the centre of events. Schachter, therefore, concludes: "......if in Philippine languages there is no single constituent type that corresponds to the subject in other languages, but instead

there are two constituent types—the topic and the actor—that divide the set of subject properties between them, then, the common assumption of the universality of subjects apparently cannot be correct" (*ibid*: 301).

1.7. Kothandaraman (1972) in a brief note, examines this problem and concludes that there can be certain verbs in languages like Tamil, Telugu and Malayalam which do not require a subject in the sentence. His enquiry, however, does not attempt to specify the characteristics of the subjectless verbs.

1.8. Scholars are reopening the issue in these days in several publications. Recognizing the importance of the problem, the departments of South Asian Studies and Linguistics of the University of Wisconsin jointly sponsored a symposium on the notion of subject in South Asian Languages in August 1975 and the papers presented at the symposium have been brought out in a volume recently (Verma, 1976). The reason for restricting the investigation on subject to South Asian Languages seems to be that they apparently present an interesting picture in regard to the question of subject. The languages that are examined in the above report belong to diverse families chiefly Indo-European and Dravidian. Thus the similarities that are found in these languages can well be considered an 'areal feature'. Sridhar in the above volume discusses four logical possibilities for the interpretation of what he calls 'the dative subject construction' (DSC). They are: (1) 'the null hypothesis' which treats DSC as 'subjectless' sentences; (2) 'the dative subject hypothesis' which equates the surface dative NP to the underlying subject; (3) 'the nominative subject hypothesis' under which the nominative NP in the DSC is both the underlying and surface subject; and (4) 'the squishy subject hypothesis' according to which, the subject of a particular sentence in a given language is that NP which exhibits 'a clear preponderance' of the properties that are characteristic of subjects in that language. Favouring the second of the above hypotheses, Sridhar suggests the following solution for a proper interpretation of the dative subject's derivation: "The dative NP indeed originates as the subject in the DSC and acts like a subject with

respect to transformations that refer to the notion of subject, but at the stage of derivation at which the rule of verb agreement applies, the dative NP is no longer the subject, hence its failure to control verb agreement" (p. 145).

1.9. Consideration of the role of subject in sentences leads us to another interesting phenomenon. Examine the following sentences :

1. Sri Krishna frightened Arjuna
2. The politicians amuse people
3. She tickles me
4. The transformationalists annoy the psycholinguists

Superficially, the initial NPs in the above are subjects. But a closer look reveals that they (the subjects) can be realizations of two role-relationships. Thus, sentence (1) can mean that Sri Krishna volitionally caused fear in Arjuna in which case the subject—NP is the 'agent'. The same sentence may also be interpreted as 'Arjuna experiencing fear on the sight of his master, the master not intending to cause that experience' in which case the subject-NP will be the 'instrument' (or 'object'). Sentences (2), (3) and (4) also submit to similar treatment. The second interpretation can also be overtly expressed by 'instrument-phrases' as below:

1 a. Sri Krishna frightened Arjuna with his 'Visvaroopa'

2 a. The politicians amuse people with their antics

3 a. She tickles me with her fingers

4 a. The transformationalists annoy the psycholinguists with their 'presuppositions'.

The above additional factors perhaps confirm the non-relevance of subject-notion as a category function of sentences. In the following section we shall see how Malayalam grammarians have tackled the problem.

2.1. Certain Malayalam verbs do not allow NPs in the nominative to occupy the initial slot of sentences. Gundert (1962) calls them 'verbs without nominative' and classes them into (i) verbs of obtaining, (ii) verbs denoting incidents to the body, (iii) verbs denoting incidents to the soul, and (iv) verbs of enduring, bearing, forbearing, etc. (pp. 189-190). It is not difficult to see that Gundert's classification of subjectless verbs is not based on the explicit properties of the verbs concerned.

2.2. Matthan (1969) has gone deeper into the problem in saying that "state, happening aud action show great difference. State is something which is possessed by the actor; happening is something in which the actor is involved; and, action is that thing which is performed by the actor. State and happening are common to both animate and inanimate objects. Action, strictly speaking, is associated with only creatures and humans" (p. 116). Further "in some verbs of happening and those which are used in that manner, the subject will be hidden. ex: *iṉikku* (*maṉassu*) *bo:dhiccu*; *avaṉə* (*tala*) *naraccu*. Such verbs are called subjectless verbs (*akarttṛvacaṉam*)" (p. 116). Verbs without subjects normally denote emotions and body-sensations. Although there is some vagueness in his statements, Matthan appears to be thinking that predominentely the class of verbs, which he is calling 'emotives' and 'states', do not need subjects for their collocationary requirements. He is also of the view that some of the 'verbs of happening' too have surface manifestations without the accompaniment of subjects. The ingenuity of his manipulation is surprisingly refreshing, especially when we recall that contemporary line of thought shows similar inclination of classifying the verbs as means of accounting for the differences in their syntactic behaviours. And yet it should be admitted that he is not clear in many respects.

2.3. Rajaraja Varma (1974) follows the Sanskrit tradition in defining the basic concepts of 'subject' and 'object'. To him "subject is the most important among case relations. If verb is divided into 'action' (*vya:pa:ra*) and 'result' (*phala*), subject is action-dependent and object is result-dependent. Sometimes both

action and result rest on one thing, and in such cases, the verb doesn't have object. Only if action and result are associated with different things, the verb is said to have object" (p. 183). On the basis of the above he attempts to give an explanation for the occurrence of subjectless sentences: "Ordinarily, we think of 'subject' as that which performs the action denoted by the verb......But, rarely, we get verbs where the action of the subject is not required. Here, the verb is self-dependent. Such a verb is called 'subject-hidden verb'......In such cases the position of the subject will have to be filled by the nominal in dative case" (p. 189). Here also, there is the implicit assumption that a sentence has a subject position despite the non-specificity of the nominal concerned and despite the flexibility of word-order in our language.

2.4. Kunnappalli (1976) makes a very brief reference to this sentence-type and comments: "In such roots the subject can be said to be a 'witness' (*'sa:kṣi'*) of the verb" (p. 227). Whether 'witness' here refers to a *'ka:raka'* relationship or not, is not clear.

2.5. McAlpin (in Verma, 1976, cited above), offering a solution for the interpretation of the dative-subject-constructions in Malayalam, states that the whole question of subjecthood involves three types as far as Malayalam is concerned: One, the usual agentive subjects; two the dative subjects; and three, subjects which are manifested by non-agentive nominative nominals. We are here concerned only with the last two of the above, more particularly the second type. Regarding the dative subjects, he says: "The clearest thread that runs through them all is a semantic one; in no case are these datives 'agents' to use Fillmore's terminology. In no case do these subjects instigate or consciously control the events of the verb. Rather they are the passive receipients of some action, event or situation beyond their active control. These dative nouns are '–conscious choice'. Nevertheless, they are the nouns most immediately associated with their verbs (and occasionally the only such noun). They control pronominalization particularly the use of resumptive (also called

reflexive) pronouns as do agentive subjects, and they occupy the same position in an unstressed sentence as a more usual subject. Thus, while being non-agents and experiencers, they do have a claim to be the subjects" (p. 187–188). Elsewhere, he contrasts between "non-agentive subjects where the subject is not the ultimate cause of the action of the verb and where the subject is in the dative" (p. 193). McAlpin's contention rests on three features: (1) immediate association with the verb, (2) control of pronominalization and (3) occurrence in the position of subjects in unstressed sentences. Among these 'immediate association with the verb' is undeterminable on the basis of any plausible objective criterion. For the second feature McAlpin does not give any examples. The third one implicitly assumes the existence of a 'subject position' which is not substantiated in his paper. Although he has rightly pointed out the semantic distinctiveness of the verbs with which the dative NPs occur, his solution falls short of expectations.

3. Abraham (1975), in his well-documented and searching paper has analysed the various characteristics of the type of Malayalam sentences which we are re-examining in this section. His main findings can be summarized as follows: (i) "......there is a class of verbs in Malayalam whose underlying (logical) subjects take dative case markers when they appear in the surface level" (p. 121). He uses the term 'pseudo-datives' to refer to such subject–NPs; (ii) all these surface pseudo-datives can be derived from corresponding deep-level logical subjects. Abraham has tried to demonstrate that, since some sentences with pseudo-datives have parallel non-dative constructions having no semantic consequences (ex: '*eṉikkə atə iṣṭappeṭṭu*'—'*ña:n atə iṣṭappeṭṭu*': p. 126), and since pseudo-datives are found to co-occur with actual datives within single sentential frames (ex: '*eṉikkə atiṉə kaḷiññu*'—p. 129), their suspected 'dativeness' is not relatable to deep sentences. Although we are in general agreement with Abraham's explanation of the characteristic features of the so-called pseudo-datives, it is, however, felt that he has gone wrong on two basic issues concerning case manifestations. Firstly, his assumption, that the surface sentences should necessarily have

subject realizations in one form or other, is untenable because of difficulties already pointed out earlier (See section 1). Secondly, he is explicitly suggesting ("......the dative forms in them should be considered as representing dative relationship EVEN IN THE UNDERLYING STRUCTURE"—p. 125, emphasis ours) that 'dative' refers to semantic relationship also. The pseudo-datives, according to him, are the overt manifestations of corresponding nominative forms which appear as 'underlying subjects' ("......the pseudo-dative construction '*enikkə*' 'for me' which must be the surface manifestation of the underlying subject '*ña:n*' 'I'......" p. 130). This latter view ascribes an obligatory subject-function to one or other NP of the source sentence. The present writer feels that this is a wrong assumption. In the ensuing paragraphs, we shall, therefore, examine the possibility of an alternate proposal.

4.1. As we have seen above, a good deal of variation, not to say inconsistency, is found in the literature with respect to the role of subject. Besides the term 'subject', such nomenclatures as 'topic', 'theme' 'particular term', 'old information' and 'focus' are used to designate an element of 'statement'. Each of these names is employed to explain the phenomenon in different contexts. Notice that none of them (except, perhaps, the subject) refers to a grammatical category. Whether we need to have a dichotomy of this sort is a matter to be settled purely on the basis of the kind of inquiry we pursue. For instance, a distinction between topic and comment is pertinent in information theory. Similarily, in logical analysis, one would be required to divide the proposition into particular and general terms. Reference to 'focussing' in verbal behaviour is necessary in psychological investigations. But as far as grammatical analysis is concerned, the notion 'subject' can be dispensed with in speaking of underlying semantic relationships. The term is relevant only in languages (like English) where the structure of sentences demands an obligatory filling up of the slot (sometimes even with a dummy form) preceding the verb.

4.2. If we accept the argument that reference to subject-category is not relevant in the analysis of Malayalam sentences,

our problem is considerably reduced almost to the extent of the phenomenon of what Abraham has termed as 'pseudo-datives'. At the outset it should be stated that the term 'pseudo-dative' is a misnomer because all the forms, which Abraham discusses in his paper, are real datives. The peculiarity is only in their appearances in sentences without the presence of a nominal in the nominative case. Let us begin by examining a sentence where a 'neutral' verb is employed. By 'neutral' we mean a verb which doesn't have psychological connotations. Consider the sentence below:

5. aya:ḷkkə eḷuttə kiṭṭi
'He got (the) letter'

Here, the implication is that something (the letter) has reached somewhere (he). Hence, 'he' functions as the 'goal' in the above. Normally, 'goal' is expressed by the dative case marker. The goal-case subsumes several sub-notions and, therefore, following Fillmore's (1971) suggestions, we might account for all these variations in meanings by using the 'principle of complementarity'. To quote Fillmore: "Sometimes we find in different sentences semantic functions which in detail are partly alike and partly different, their difference being systematically relatable to differences in the semantic properties of the lexical material they are in construction with" (*ibid*: 250). Besides 'goal' which is the typical semantic correlate of dative expressions, there are other notions some of which overlap with other case-notions as shown below:

6. ña:n me:ma:sattil pu:ṉakkə po:kum (destination)
'In the month of May I will go to Poona'

7. a:ṟumaṇikkə na:ṭakam tuṭaṅṅum (time)
'The drama will start at 6.O' clock'

8. i: marunnə neṟṟikkə taṭavaṇam (location)
'Apply this medicine on the forehead'

9. ya:trakku ve:ṇṭatella:m orukkivekku (purpose)
'Arrange the things for the travel'

10. muṟikku puṟattu kaṭakku (relation ?)
   'Step out of the room'

11. eṉikkə raṇṭə a:ṇkuṭṭikaḷ uṇṭə (possession)
   'I have two sons'

In (5), we would, therefore, state that the dative nominal is the surface realization of the underlying 'goal-case'. Appearance of the nominal in the initial position is a matter of 'emphasis' only; it does not indicate the subject-status of the noun. If the order of the words is slightly changed as below,

5. a. eḻuttə aya:ḷkkə kiṭṭi

the emphasis is shifted from the 'goal' to the 'object'.

4.3. As mentioned above, the general case-frame 'goal' consists of several complementary sub-cases, predominant among which include 'experience' and 'possession'. These presuppose an 'experiencer' and a 'possessor' respectively. The overt signalling of these relationships is done with dative case markers in the language as illustrated hereunder:

(experience):

12. eṉikkə viśakkunnu — 'I am hungry'

13. eṉikkə ve:daṉikkunnu — 'I feel pain'

14. eṉikkə to:nnunnu — 'It appears to me'

15. eṉikkə paṉikkunnu — 'I feel feverish'

(possession):

16. avaḷkkə soundaryam uṇṭə — 'She has beauty'

(Note:—In '*avaḷuṭe soundaryam*' the attributive phrase retains the possessive meaning)

17. i: pustakattiṉə pattu ru:paya:ṇə vila
   'The price for this book is ten rupees'

(Note:—Both the above and its genitive counterpart '*i: pustakattiṉṯe vila pattu ru:paya:ṇə*' denote 'abstract possession'.)

4.4. Granting that all subjectless sentences can be semantically explained as hinted in 4.2. and 4.3., how do we interpret

parallel sentences where the same NPs appear in nominative and dative cases "without affecting any meaning change" (Abraham *op.cit.* p. 125). Abraham lists the following pairs in support of his observation (p. 126):

18. a. eṉikkə viyarttu 'for me—perspired'
    b. ña:n viyarttu 'I—perspired'

19. a. eṉikkə viṟaccu 'for me—shivered'
    b. ña:n viṟaccu 'I—shivered'

20. a. eṉikkə valla:te viśannu
    'for me—terribly—felt hunger'
    b. ña:n valla:te viśannu
    'I—terribly—felt hunger'

21. a. eṉikkə atə iṣṭappeṭṭu
    'for me—it—liked'
    b. ña:n atə iṣṭappeṭṭu
    'I—it—liked'

The possibility of a choice of cases having no semantic consequence, Abraham reminds, indicates that "the occurrences of dative nouns as subjects cannot be a synatctic contravention in Malayalam" (p. 126). The present writer feels that the pairs, illustrated above, are not synonymous. While the dative nominal in (18. a) stands for the 'experiencer', the nominative in (18. b) represents the underlying notion of 'location'. The semantic distinction becomes explicit in the following expanded forms:

22. a. eṉikkə mukham viyarttu
    'for me—face—perspired'
    b. *ña:n—mukham—viyarttu
    'I—face—perspired'

If 'ña:n' in (18. b) is not locative, (22. b) should be acceptable but it is not because of the presence of another nominal '*mukham*' in the locative. (22. a) on the other hand, is grammatical because 'eṉikkə', as mentioned already is 'experiencer'. Consider the following,

22. c. eṉṯe mukham viyarttu
'my—face—perspired'

which is also well-formed as two NPs in the same case-relation do not clash here. The same argument holds good for (19. a) and (19. b) as seen below:

23. a. eṉikkə kai viṟaccu
'for—me—hand—shivered'

b. *ña:n kai viṟaccu
'I—hand—shivered'

c. eṉṯe kai viṟaccu
'my—hand—shivered'

But (20. a) and (20. b) present certain problems. Abraham himself has stated in a foot-note that (20. b) is a usage which "is found in the dialects of Central and Southern Kerala" (p. 135), thereby implying that the same is not a standard form. The sentence is unacceptable to the present writer (his idiolect?, dialect?, intuition?). Though Abraham takes the usage as grammatical (at least in certain dialects), we doubt very much whether he would vouch for the well-formedness of the following:

24. ? kuṭṭi viśakkunnu; ve:gam pa:lə koṭukku
'The child is hungry; quick, give (him) milk'

25. ? ni: viśakkunnuṇṭo:?
'Are you hungry?'

26. ? a:ra:ṇə viśakkunnatə
'Who is hungry?'

27. ? ñaññaḷonnum viśakkunnilla
'We are not hungry in any way'

In all the above, the corresponding dative forms make the sentences perfectly acceptable.

4.5. Abraham's last example (21. a and 21. b) contains a compound verb, '*iṣṭappeṭu*' which belongs to the class of 'verbs

of experience' and as such we naturally expect it to co-occur with a dative nominal but (21. b) contradicts the expectation. Perhaps, cases like this, as Abraham suspects, are surface overlappings of case realization.

4.6: There is one more type of sentences which Abraham examines and which deserves special treatment. The type refers to the occurrence of two datives in a simple sentence "which is rather unusual" (*ibid.* p. 129). Here again the solution he offers is that one of the dative is not real and the same is to be related to an 'underlying nominative'(?). The sentence below illustrates the type:

28. enikkə atinə kaliññu
'for me—that (dative)—was possible'
'I was able to do that'

It is not the occurrence of the 'case-form' more than once in a simple sentence which would be 'unusual'. The 'one case—principle', as suggested by Fillmore and which has been proved to be not universal, refers to deep-cases or case—roles. So there is nothing extraordinary in two datives collocating in (28) if they can be shown to refer to separate case relationships. The sense conveyed by *atinə* (which is used as an anaphoric pronoun) in the sentence is related to a verbal infinitive (purpose) whereas *enikkə* stands for the 'possessor' of the capacity which the modal verb ('*kaliy*') expresses. A different paraphrase of (28) in English where the 'possessor of ability' is shifted from the subject position to the VP (as below) strengthens our argument:

29. It was possible for me to do that

Further, (28) is not structurally different from (30):

30. enikkə parakka:n kaliññu
'I was able to fly'

5. We do realize (after all the above ramblings) that we have attempted to tackle a very sticky problem here. Nonetheless, it is hoped that we have succeeded in showing that,

(i) as far as Malayalam is concerned (and perhaps other Dravidian languages also) the subject-notion is not required for an adequate interpretation of the semantic import of a sentence;

(ii) the surface dative is related to several complementary case-relations, a major part of which can be included in the general underlying case 'goal';

(iii) the apparent parallel constructions are, in fact, realizations of distinct semantic relationships;

and also

(iv) there remain many more questions within the area of this inquiry which are left unanswered.

eleven

Vocal Segregates

1. Introduction

Vocal communication encompasses both linguistic and non-linguistic codes. The non-linguistic signs, when they occur in conjunction with linguistic signs, mostly have secondary functions, i.e. adding complementary or qualificatory information to the content present in the verbal code. An example for this would be the following simple utterance in Malayalam:

1. ña:n varilla   'I will not come'

The above, if articulated with non-distinctive modulations, would constitute a mere statement, meaning 'I will not come'; but the same delivered with faster tempo and heavier syllabic stress, shows the speaker's 'determination' or, (if the modulations

are stronger) 'refusal'. In the latter senses, the utterance would roughly mean 'I have decided not to come', and 'I refuse to come' respectively. These vocal features are not usually discussed within the central region of linguistic desciption, namely, the 'grammar proper'. It could be seen that many of these concomitant tonal variations are non-linguistic vocalizations. The existence of meaningful modulations in languages has compelled analysts to dichotomize the content-level also. Ogden & Richards (1923) make a distinction between 'intellectual' and 'emotional' information. The terms 'semantic' and 'affective' information employed in Soskin & Kauffman (1961) seem to be better suited in distinguishing the two types of contents.

2. Paralanguage

Non-linguistic vocal codes which convey information—both semantic and affective—are extensively discussed in recent studies on paralanguage. Paralanguage refers to "a set of means of communication produced by the speech organs but not included in the central area of linguistic structure organized as a multilevel system" (Rensky, 1966: 97). The definition given above is one among many; the term 'paralanguage', for some people, is "a cover-all term, referring to all the non-verbal properties of speech......and occasionally, even, kinesics is brought under this heading" (see further Crystal, 1969: 292). Paralanguage is usually divided into 'voice set' as background for, and 'voice qualities' and 'vocalizations' as accompaniments of language proper (Trager, 1958). Voice set refers to the physiological and physical peculiarities of individuals as members of a social group. Voice qualities are the wide range of modulations that accompany speech flow and can be identified on such gradients as pitch range, lip control, rhythm control, resonance, tempo, etc. What is called voice quality here belongs to two separate realms of the aural medium, according to Abercrombie (1967). The non-segmental components of the medium fall into two groups, namely, 'voice quality' and 'voice dynamics'. This distinction is not very important for our purpose here. In contrast with voice set and voice qualities, which are overall or background characteristics, vocalizations are

actual specifically identifiable sounds or aspects of sounds. This paralinguistic class contains three groups of items: (1) Vocal characteristics, which include such items as laughing, crying, yelling, whispering, moaning, groaning, etc., (2) Vocal qualifiers, which refer to variations in intensity, pitch height and extent, and (3) Vocal segregates which comprise sound sequences which are usually called (though not altogether precisely) 'interjections'. It is not difficult to see that the first of the above three types is a peripheral phenomenon as far as language study is concerned. No doubt, the items which fall under this category, are 'expressive' behaviours, but they are not, strictly speaking, 'communicative' behaviours. Vocal qualifiers, the second class of the above, have, by and large, secondary functions. They are employed either to reinforce the linguistic message, or, to contradict it. The last of the above classes, vocal segregates, constitute a radically unique class of vocalizations. These are communicative responses in contrast with vocal characteristics, and are not concomitant features which distinguish them from vocal qualifiers. Furthermore, vocal segregates occupy a position closer to language proper than others.

3. Interjections

The traditional term, which comes close to the meaning of what we call 'vocal segregate', is 'interjection'. A dictionary definition of interjection runs as follows: 'A natural ejaculation expressive of some feeling or emotion' (The Oxford English Dictionary, 1933). Interjection had come to be classed along with other grammatical categories as early as the beginning of Christian Era by Grecian grammarians (Robins, 1970: 188–189). But in ancient Oriental grammars this category has not been recognized as a separate word-class. In *Aṣṭa:dhya:yi* of Panini as well as in later Sanskrit grammars, only four word-classes are distinguished, nouns (*na:man*), verbs (*a:khya:ta*), prepositions (*upasarga*) and particles (*nipa:ta*). Although no clear mention has been made by either Panini or, his immediate followers, it could be assumed that interjections would fall within the category of particles. This assumption should be accepted with great caution as "there often

are no hard and fast lines drawn between adverbs, particles, prepositions, or rather, one and the same element may fulfill more than one function (Gonda, 1968: 183).

4. Signal versus Symbol

Fries (1959: 52–53) remarks that items usually called as interjections do not have communicative purpose. He seems to be considering only those vocal sounds which are reflexes of immediate stimuli. The same vocal sound can either be interpreted as a signal or symbol depending on the situation in which it occurs. For instance, the vocalization, *ayyo*: will be a signal if it is a spontaneous ejaculatory response—a reflex behaviour—to a frightening visual stimulus (or to a painful tactile sensation). If, on the other hand, the same is a volitional act expressing sympathy, it is to be treated as a symbol. Presumably, Fries is considering only the first of the above usages which obviously does not elicit regular predictable responses, and thus lacks communicative function. But, isolates, which are volitionally used, are communicative utterances. Ekman and Friesen (1969) mention a parallel situation in non-verbal behaviour. For them, there are both 'communicative' as well as 'informative' non-verbal behaviours, the former being "acts which are clearly and consciously intended by the sender to transmit a specifiable message to the receiver" and the latter "those acts which have some decoded meaning in that such acts elicit similar interpretations in some set of observers" (p. 55).

5. Acts and Reflexes

The delimitation of interjections as those which fall within the area of communicative behaviour, naturally, leads to a dismissal of the traditional concept of interjections held by grammarians. We are, therefore, suggesting that a clear distinction has to be made between vocalizations that are intentional acts and those that are non-volitional reflexes. Unless this is done, a large number of non-discrete vocal sounds, which have only the status of signals, would have to be treated on a par with those having specific symbolic functions.

6. Properties of Vocal Segregates

The modified proposal, which we are trying to present in this study, results in the recognition of a clsss of vocal expressions which we have called 'vocal segregates' and which exhibit the following properties:

(i) they have communicative function;

(ii) they may, but need not necessarily, co-occur with sentences;

(iii) they exhibit tactical independence;

(iv) they have internal unitary structures;

(v) they show a unique phonological structure;

(vi) they are semantically non-decomposable;

(vii) they are less susceptible to diachronic changes.

7. Classification of Vocal Segregates in Malayalam

We shall first make a distinction between the lexemes which appear functionally as vocal segregates and the vocal isolates which do not form part of the lexical stock but always occur as vocal segregates. The two classes can be called 'Derived Vocal Segregates' (DVS), and 'Inherent Vocal Segregates' (IVS) respectively. Both these classes are exemplified below:

(A) *DVS:*

2. *pa:vam*; avan to:ṟṟupo:yatre
'Alas! He is said to have failed'

3. *kaṣṭam*; a: kuṭṭi ve:danakoṇṭə karayunnu
'Pity! That child is crying with pain'

4. *na:śam*; ni: iviṭe:yumettiyo:
'Confound it! Did you reach here too?'

5. *enta:*; niṅṅaḷkkavaṉe viśva:samillenno:
'What! You don't trust him?'

(B) *IVS*:

6. *cchi:*; iteṉikkə ve:ṇṭa
'(expression of contempt); I don't want it'

7. *a:vu*; ña:n rakşappeṭṭu
'(expression of relief); I am saved'

8. *e:y*; avaḷ aṅṅaṉeyonnum paṟaññirikkilla
'(expression of emphatic negation); She would not have said like that'.

9. *o:ho:*; idde:hama:nə putiya kalakṭar; alle:
'(expression of realization); So this gentleman is the new collector'

10. *m—m* 'negation'

11. ẽ: 'responding to an address'

12. *ayye:* 'expression of contempt or mockery'

(Note:—The phonic structures of vocal segregates deserve special investigation. This study does not go into that aspect.) Phrases functioning as segregates, constitute a subclass of DVS. In Malayalam, phrasal vocal segregates are very rare, the most common being the genitive-vocative combinations of the following type:

13. eṉṯi:śvara: 'My God!'

(It is worth pointing out that although (13) formally resembles a genitival noun phrase, in its interjectional use it does not show the function of a genitival construction).

A different classification can be made based on the meanings of vocal segregates. Thus, 'emotive vocal segregates' (EVS) will include those isolates which have emotive meanings and 'non-emotive vocal segregates' (NEVS) will comprise of the rest of the items. These two classes are exemplified below:

(A) *EVS*:

(i)—(DVS)

ayyo: (fear or sympathy), pa:vam
(sympathy), kaşṭam (sympathy)
na:śam (curse), entə (surprise)

(ii)—(IVS)

ha:y (exhilaration) cchi:/cche
(contempt), pbhu (contempt).

(B) *NEVS:*

(i)—(DVS)

14. *enna:(l)*, ña:n iraññaṭṭe
'Well, let me leave'

15. *appo:(l)*, namukkə aññaṉe niścayikka:m
'Then, let us decide like that'

16. *śari*, niṅṅaḷ po:yiṭṭu varu
'Right, you may go'

17. *enta:*, ni: po:ka:n taṉṉe ti:ruma:ṉicco:
'Well, have you decided to go?'

18. *a:ṭṭe*, niṉakkatə ceyya:mo:
'Well, can you do that?'

19. *piṉṉe:y*, eṉṯe ka:ryam maṟakkarute:
'Now, don't forget my matter'

The English glosses given above for the pre-sentential Malayalam isolates are not exact equivalents. It is not easy to find correspondences in other languages for such elements. Further, the class illustrated as NEVS (i), differs from other segregates in two respects. Whereas items belonging to classes EVS (i), EVS (ii) (see above) and NEVS (ii) (see below) can occur independently (without a sentence stringed to them) or pre-sententially or post-sententially, the isolates belonging to NEVS (i) are relatively fixated in their pre-sentential positions. Thus (20. a) and (20. b) below, are normal utterances while (21-24) strike us as odd:

20. a. *kaṣṭam*, avaḷkkə ka:ṉsaṟa:ṇatre
'Alas! She is said to have cancer'

20. b. avaḷkkə ka:ṉsara:ṇatre, *kaṣṭam*
'She is said to have cancer, alas!'

21. ? ña:n iraññaṭṭe, *enna:(l)* (cf. 14)

22. ? namukkə aññaṉe niścayikka:m, *appo:(l)* (cf. 15)

23. ? niṅṅaḷ po:yiṭṭu varu, *śari* (cf. 16)

24. ? ni: po:ka:ntaṉṉe ti:ruma:ṉicco:, *enta:* (cf. 17)

The items belonging to class NEVS (i) are unique in certain other respects also. These words do not retain their original meanings in their usages as segregates (see sentences 14–19 above). In conversational interactions, the participants usually employ certain conventional signals in order to establish appropriate contacts and also to make explicit the speaker's intention of switching the topics of discourse. A brief reference of such 'Discourse Markers' can be seen in Yngve, (1970).

(ii)—(IVS)

25. ɛ: (responding to a call)

26. o:ho:̃ (expression of realization)

27. e:y (calling someone's attention)

28. m ↑ (expression of non-receipt of the message)

8. Conclusion

An individual's overall communicative behaviour is a pattern of several elements of discrete behaviours. Linguists concern themselves *only with one segment of communication.* Recent studies on paralanguage have highlighted the importance of a linguistically peripheral sphere of communication. We have attempted here to review very briefly a fragment of that sphere.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abercrombie, David. 1967: ELEMENTS OF GENERAL PHONETICS. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Abraham, P. T. 1976: 'Pseudo-datives in Malayalam.' S. Agesthialingom & K. Kushalappa Gowda (eds.): DRAVIDIAN CASE SYSTEM. Annamalainagar: Annamalai University.

Achutanunni, Chathanath & S. Chandanapalli. 1967: VARTHAMA: NAPUSTAKATHINU ORAVATA:RIKA. Kottayam: National Book Stall.

Ananthanarayana, H. S. 1970: 'The Ka:raka theory and Case Grammar'. INDIAN LINGUISTICS. 30.

Andronov, M. 1972: 'Notes on the nature and Origin of the adjective in Tamil.' S. Agesthialingom & S. V. Shanmugham (eds.): THIRD SEMINAR ON DRAVIDIAN LINGUISTICS. Annamalainagar: Annamalai University.

Antony, C. L. 1969: BHA:SHA:PATHANANGAL. Kottayam: National Book Stall.

Asher, R. E. 1968: 'Existential, Possessive, Locative and Copulative Sentences in Malayalam.' John W. M. Verhaar (ed.): THE VERB 'BE' AND ITS SYNONYMS. Pt. 2. Foundations of Language Supplementary Series, Vol. 6. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Bach, Emmon. 1968: 'Nouns and noun phrases.' Emmon Bach & Robert T. Harms (eds.): UNIVERSALS IN LINGUISTIC THEORY. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bennett, David C. 1972: 'Some observations concerning the Locative—Directional distinction.' SEMIOTICA. 5.1.

Bever, T. G. 1972: 'Perceptions, Thought & Language.' J. B. Carrol & Roy. O. Freedle (eds.): LANGUAGE COM-

PREHENSION AND THE ACQUISITION OF KNOWLEDGE. Washington, D. C: V. H. Winston & Sons.

Bierwisch, Manfred. 1967: 'Some Semantic Universals of German adjectivals.' FOUNDATIONS OF LANGUAGE. 3.

Bloomfield, L. 1956: LANGUAGE. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1967: 'Adjectives in English: attribution and predication.' LINGUA. 18.

——— 1972: DEGREE WORDS. The Hague: Mouton.

Caldwell, Rev. Robert, 1956: A COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR OF THE DRAVIDIAN OR SOUTH INDIAN FAMILY OF LANGUAGES. Madras: University of Madras.

Chafe, Wallace L. 1970: MEANING AND THE STRUCTURE OF LANGUAGE. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Chandrasekhar, A. 1959: 'The Language of De:vi:ma:ha:tmyam.' INDIAN LINGUISTICS. (Turner Jubilee Volume).

——— 1969: 'The Language of Nalo:pa:khya:nam.' INDIAN LINGUISTICS. 30.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965: ASPECTS OF THE THEORY OF SYNTAX. Cambridge, Mass: M. I. T. Press.

Chummar, T. M. 1969: BHA:SHA:GADYAṢA:HITHYA CHARITRAM. Koṭtayam: National Book Stall.

Crystal, David. 1969: PROSODIC SYSTEMS AND INTONATION IN ENGLISH. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Curme, George O. 1935: PARTS OF SPEECH AND ACCIDENCE. Boston: D. C. Heath & Company.

Danks, Joseph & Sam Glucksberg. 1971: 'Psychological Scaling of adjective orders.' JOURNAL OF VERBAL LEARNING AND VERBAL BEHAVIOR. 10.

Darden, Bill J. 1969: 'On the question of the Copula.' PAPERS FROM THE FIFTH REGIONAL MEETING, CHICAGO LINGUISTIC SOCIETY. Chicago: University of Chicago.

de Groot, A. W. 1956–57: 'Classification of word groups.' LINGUA. 6.

Ekman, P. & W. V. Friesen. 1969: 'The repertorie of non-verbal behaviour: Categories, origins, usage and coding.' SEMIOTICA. 1.

Ezhuthachan, K. N. 1960: BHA:SHA:KAUTALI:YAM. Madras: University of Madras.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1971: 'Absence of Copula and the notion of simplicity.' LANGUAGE STRUCTURE AND LANGUAGE USE. Essays by Charles A. Ferguson. California: Stanford University Press.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1968: 'The case for Case.' Emmon Bach & R. T. Harms (eds.): UNIVERSALS IN LANGUAGE. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

——— 1968 a: 'Lexlcal entries for verbs.' FOUNDATIONS OF LANGUAGE. 4.

——— 1971: 'Some problems for case grammar.' Charles Fillmore (ed.): WORKING PAPERS IN LINGUISTICS. No. 10. Ohio: The Ohio State University.

——— 1972: 'Subjects, Speakers and Roles.' Donald Davidson & Gilbert Harman (eds.): SEMANTICS OF NATURAL LANGUAGE. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Francis, W. Nelson. 1958: THE STRUCTURE OF AMERICAN ENGLISH. New York: The Ronald Press Company.

Fries, C. C. 1959: THE STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH. London: Longmans, Green & Company.

Frohnmeyer, L. J. 1913: A PROGRESSIVE GRAMMAR OF MALAYALAM LANGUAGE FOR EUROPEANS. Mangalore: Basel Mission Book and Tract Depository.

Givon, Talmy. 1970: 'Notes on the semantic structure of English Adjectives.' LANGUAGE. 46.

Gonda, J. 1968: 'The Sanskrit Particle Api.' LINGUA. 21.

Gruber, J. S. 1967: 'Look and See' LANGUAGE. 43.

Gundert, H. 1962: MALAYA:LABHA:SHA: VYA:KARANAM. Kottayam: National Book Stall (First Published in 1868).

Ikegami, Yoshihiko. 1973: 'A set of basic patterns for the semantic structure of the verb.' LINGUISTICS. 117.

Jesperson, Otto. 1968: THE PHILOSOPHY OF GRAMMAR. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.

Kahn, Charles H. 1973: 'The verb 'Be' in Ancient Greek.' John W. M. Verhaar (ed.): THE VERB 'BE' AND ITS SYNONYMS. Pt. 6. Foundations of Language Supplement Series. Vol. 16. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Kothandaraman, P. 1972: STUDIES IN TAMIL LINGUISTICS. Madras: Tamil Nu:lagam.

Kovunni Nedungadi, T. M. 1930: KE:RALAKOUMUDI. Calicut: Ramakrishna Press.

Kunjan Pillai, Ilamkulam. (ed.) 1958: LI:LA:THILAKAM. Kottayam: National Book Stall.

Kunnappally, John. 1976: SABDASOUBHAGAM. Alwaye: Pontifical Institute Publications.

Kuroda, S-Y. 1965: GENERATIVE GRAMMATICAL STUDIES IN THE JAPANESE LANGUAGE. Ph.D. dissertation, M. I. T.

Labov, William. 1969: 'Contraction, deletion and Inherent variability of the English Copula.' LANGUAGE. 45.4.

Lakoff, G, & J. R. Ross. 1976: 'Is deep structure necessary?' J. D. McCawley (ed.): SYNTAX AND SEMANTICS. Vol. 7. New York: Academic Press.

Lakoff, G, & Stanley Peters. 1969: 'Phrasal Conjunction and symmetric predicates.' David A. Reibel & Stanford A. Schane (eds.): MODERN STUDIES IN ENGLISH. Englewood Cliff, N. J: Prentice Hall.

Lazarus, L. M. 1973: 'The deep structure of the prenominal adjective in English.' LINGUISTICS. 102.

Lee, Gregory. 1971: 'Subjects and Agents: II.' WORKING PAPERS IN LINGUISTICS. No. 7. The Ohio State University.

Lees, Robert B. 1963: THE GRAMMAR OF ENGLISH NOMINALIZATIONS. Indiana, Bloomington: Indiana University Research Centre in Anthropology, Folklore & Linguistics.

Matthan, George. 1969: MALAYA:LMAYUTE VYA:KARANAM. Kottayam: National Book Stall (First published in 1863).

McCawley, J. D. 1970: 'English as VSO language.' LANGUAGE. 46.

Narayana Pillai, P. K. 1951: PRA:CHI:NAMALAYA:LAGADYAMA:TRUKAKAL. Trivandrum: Travancore University.

Nilsen, D. L. F. 1973: THE INSTRUMENTAL CASE IN ENGLISH. The Hague: Mouton.

Ogden, C. K. & I. A. Richards. 1923: THE MEANING OF MEANING. London: Routledge & Kegan.

Quine, William Van Orman. 1960: WORD AND OBJECT: New York: M. I. T. & John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Quirk, et. al. 1972: A GRAMMAR OF CONTEMPORARY ENGLISH. London: Longman.

Rajaraja Varma, A. R. 1974: KE:RALAPA:NINI:YAM. Kottayam: National Book Stall. (First published in 1895).

Ramaswami Aiyyar, L. V. 1925: A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF MALAYALAM PHONETICS. Calcutta: University Press.

——— 1936: THE EVOLUTION OF MALAYALAM MORPHOLOGY. Trichur: The Rama Varma Research Institute.

Rensky, Miroslav. 1966: 'The systematics of paralanguage.' TRAVAUX LINGUISTIQUES DE PRAGUE. 2.

Robins, R. H. 1970: DIVERSIONS IN BLOOMSBURY. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Roose, H. 1962: 'Order of post-adjuncts to nouns in Dutch.' LINGUA. 11.

Schachter, Paul. 1977: 'Reference-related and role-related properties of subjects.' Peter Cole & Jerrold M. Sadock (eds.): SYNTAX AND SEMANTICS. Vol. 8. New York: Academic Press.

Schank, Roger & Larry Tesler. 1970: 'A conceptual dependency parser for natural languages.' STATISTICAL METHODS IN LINGUISTICS. 6.

Schlesinger, I. M. 1971: 'Production of utterances and language acquisition.' D. I. Slobin (ed.): THE ONTOGENESIS OF GRAMMAR. New York: Academic Press.

Seshagiri Prabhu, M. 1922: VYA:KARANAMITRAM. Mangalore: Kanarese Press & Book Depot.

Smith, Carlota S. 1969: 'Ambiguous sentences with *and*.' David A. Reibel & Stanford A. Schane (eds.): MODERN STUDIES IN ENGLISH. Engle-wood Cliff, N. J.: Prentice Hall.

Soskin, W. F. & P. Kauffman. 1961: 'Judgement of emotion in free voice samples.' JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION.

Stratton, Charles R. 1971: 'The Pathological Case.' Charless J. Fillmore (ed.): WORKING PAPERS IN LINGUISTICS. No. 10. Ohio: The Ohio State University.

Sukumaran, V. 1974: 'Malaya:lathile svanimangalum aksharangalum.' K. M. Prabhakara Variar & P. N. Ravindran (eds.): MALAYA:LABHA:SHA:PATHANANGAL. Trivandrum: State Institute of Languages.

Trager, G. L. 1958: 'Paralanguage: a first approximation.' STUDIES IN LINGUISTICS. 13.

Vasudeva Bhattathiri, C. V. 1974: 'Aka:rathinte dhvanibhe:dangal.' VIJNANAKAIRALI. 6.1.

Velayudhan Pillai, P. V. 1968: MADHYAKA:LAMALAYA:LAM. Kottayam: National Book Stall.

Verma, Manindra K. (ed.) 1976: THE NOTION OF SUBJECT IN SOUTH ASIAN LANGUAGES. Madison: South Asian Studies, University of Wisconsin.

Winter, Werner. 1965: 'Transforms without Kernels?' LANGUAGE. 41.

Yang, Dong-Whee. 1971: 'Double subject verbs in Korean.' WORKING PAPERS IN LINGUISTICS. No. 10. Ohio: The Ohio State University.

Yngve, Victor H. 1970: 'On getting a word in edgewise.' PAPERS FROM THE SIXTH REGIONAL MEETING, CHICAGO LINGUISTIC SOCIETY. Chicago: Chicago University.

Yotsukura, Sayo. 1970: THE ARTICLES IN ENGLISH. The Hague: Mouton.

Ziff, P. 1960: SEMANTIC ANALYSIS. New York: Cornell University Press.

GLOSSARY OF TECHNICAL TERMS

ACOUSTIC PHONETICIAN :

Phonetician who studies the physical properties of speech sounds.

ACT :

Behaviour which is intentional, as opposed to *Reflex*.

ACTIVE (VERB) :

Verbs having *Agentive* involvement; verbs denoting volitional action.

ADESSIVE :

One of the meanings of locative case : 'near':

AFFECTIVE INFORMATION :

Information which has purely psychological value; expression of emotions only.

AFFRICATE :

A phonological unit consisting of a *Stop* articulation followed by a *Fricative* articulation.

AGENT :

Instigator of action represented by the verb; a case relation.

ALLOGRAPH :

A written language symbol which is a variant of a *Grapheme*.

ALLOPHONE :

A Phone (a minimal sound unit) which is a variant of a *Phoneme*.

ALTERNANT :

Morphological variant, usually used to refer to a variant of a stem.

ALVEOLAR :

Sound produced by the contact of the tip of the tongue against alveolum.

ANAPHORIC PRONOUN :

Pronoun which stands in reference to an antecedent noun.

APPOSITIVE :

(See page 34).

AREAL FEATURE :

A feature which is not restricted to a particular language, but which is found extending through a vast area consisting of several unrelated languages.

ARTICULATORY PHONETICS :

Study of language sounds by describing how they are produced by speakers; physiological description of speech sounds.

ATTRIBUTE :

An inclusive term for any word which always co-occurs with a noun qualifying it.

AUGUMENT :

Empty Morph post-fixed to a word.

AUXILARY (VERB) :

A verb which co-occurs after the main verb indicating a secondary (usually aspectual or attitudinal) meaning.

BACK VOWEL :

Vowel produced when the posterior portion of the tongue participates in the articulation.

BASE FORM :

Form which is basic and from which other related forms are derived by affixations.

BOUND FORM :

A Morphological form which does not have independent occurrence, like a suffix.

CATEGORY FUNCTION:

The function of a grammatical *Form Class*.

CLITIC:

:

A form which appears at the end of the sentence, modifying the sense of the whole sentence.

COMMENT:

A semantic component of a sentence, roughly paraphrasable as 'that which is spoken about something', as opposed to *Topic*.

COMPLEMENTATION:

The state when two linguistic units are mutually exclusive in occurrence; that is, if two similar units do not appear in the same environment, they are said to be in complementation.

CONTENT WORD:

A word which has lexically specifiable meaning, as opposed to *Function Word*.

COPULA:

A *Predicator* which functions as a connecting verb in a sentence.

COPULATIVE SENTENCE:

A sentence which has *Copula* as the verb.

CREOLE:

When a *Pidgin* is learnt and used as a first language by later generations, then, that language is called Ceole.

DEEP CASE:

The meaning relationship of a case form.

DEEP STRUCTURE:

The underlying structure of a sentence; for some deep structure is purely syntactic; for others it is semantic.

DEEP SUBJECT:

Subject occurring in the *Deep Structure*. as opposed to *Surface Subject*.

DEFECTIVE VERB:

A verb which does not have all the conjugations.

DEICTIC:

Meaning 'pointing to'.

DEMONSTRATIVE:

An *Aitribute* having *Deictic* function.

DETERMINER:

A class of *Attributes* consisting of articles, *Demonstratives* and *Genitives.*

DIACHRONIC (STUDY):

Historical study of a phenomenon; diachronic linguistics, therefore, means the study of the history of language changes as time passes.

DIALECT:

The collective speech characteristics of a community within a language group.

DIRECTIVE:

The casal function meaning 'moving towards'.

DISCOURSE MARKER:

A linguistic sign (lexical or non-lexical) which is used to control intercommunicative behaviour. (See page 128).

DISTINCTIVE FEATURE:

Each phone is considered as a complex speech unit which consists of ultimate constituents capable of differentiating one sound unit from other; such minimal ultimate features are called distinctive features.

DUMMY VERB:

Verb which does not have lexical meaning and which functions only as a *Predicator.*

ELLIPTICAL:

Utterance which does not have the full syntactic form.

EMBEDDED CONSTRUCTION:

A sentence whtch is used within a larger sentential construction.

EMOTIVE (VERB):

Verb denoting emotions.

EMPHASISING FUNCTION:

The function which stresses a particular component of a sentence.

EMPTY MORPH:

A Morph which does not have a recognizable content.

ENTAILMENT RULE:

A condition the import of which is not expressed overtly but the recognition of which is a pre-condition for deciding the well-formedness of a sentence.

QUATIVE:

Any function which links two linguistic elements.

EXISTENTIAL SENTENCE:

Sentence which has *Existential Verb* as *Predicator.*

EXISTENTIAL (VERB):

Verb which has the meaning 'there exists'.

EXPERIENTAL (VERB):

Verb denoting experience.

FLAP:

Speech sound produced by a simple tap of the tongue against the point of articulation.

FORM CLASS:

Grammatical class based on the *Morphological* form.

FRICATIVE:

Special sound produced when air passes through a stricture with friction between the articulator and the point of articulation; another term *Spirant.*

FRONT VOWEL:

Vowel produced when the front portion of the tongue participates in the articulation.

FUNCTION WORD:

Word which does not carry lexical meaning but reveals only grammatical function, as opposed to *Content Word*; also called *Functor.*

FUNCTOR:

(See *Function Word.*)

GENERATIVE GRAMMAR:

The theory proposed by Noam Chomsky where all complex syntactic structures are said to be derivable from basic underlying sentence—structures by means of specific *Transformations.*

GENITIVE:

Usually considered as a case, but actually a sub-class of *Attributes*; also called 'possessive'.

GLOTTIS:

Soft membrane situated inside the throat through which air passes while speaking; responsible mainly for differentiating *Voiced* and *Voiceless* sounds.

GOAL:

Case relation meaning 'receipient' or 'destination'.

GRAPHEME:

The minimal functional unit of a representation of a linguistic sound in natural language; term used to refer to complex *Allographic* relations of one written symbol.

HEAD NOUN:

The noun which is the function—carrying constituent of a *Noun Phrase.*

IDIOLECT:

The totality of speech habits of an individual.

INDECLINABLE:

A word that does not submit to *Morphological* modification.

INESSIVE:

One of the meanings of locative; 'inside'.

INFLECTION:

The *Morphological* modification which does not change the grammatical category and which usually is the ultimate element of a word.

INFORMATION THEORY:

Theory which studies the measurement of transmitted messages.

INSTRUMENT:

Case relation meaning 'to use with'.

INTERJECTION:

A *Minor Sentence* traditionally (but incorrectly) considered as one of the 'parts of speech'; usually but not always an expression of emotion.

INTERVOCALIC:

Between vowels.

KINESICS:

Study of communication through body movements.

LABIAL:

Speech sound articulated with the help of lips.

LATERAL:

Speech sound articulated when air passes through the two sides of the tongue; the l-like sound.

LAXNESS:

Articulation with weak muscular pressure.

LIMITING:

A class of *Attributes* which limits the range of the *Head Noun*.

LINGUISTIC ONTOGENY:

Study of the acquisition of language by children; language development in an individual.

LINGUISTIC PHYLOGENY:

Study of the history of language development in general through ages.

LIQUID:

The l-like sounds.

LITERARY STYLISTICS:

The branch of study which investigates the peculiarities of language used in literature.

MEDIAL:

Sound which has both vocalic and consonantal qualities; V and Y.

MEDIATION.

The case relation meaning 'through'; the case function of 'medium':

MINOR SENTENCE:

Sentence which does not conform to the full syntactic structure; usually *Interjections,* vocatives and *Elliptical* sentences are included herein.

MONOSYLLABIC.

Consisting of one syllable.

MORPHOLOGICAL:

Pertaining to the minimal meaningful units of language.

MORPHOTACTICS.

Study of the combinatory structure of the meaningful units of language.

MOTION VERB.

Verb denoting 'movement':

MOVEMENT VERB.

Same as '*Motion Verb*'.

NARRATIVE TENSE:

See page 20.

NOMINALIZATION:

Process by which some other grammatical category (usually verb or *Attribute*) is transformed into a noun by some *morphological* means.

NOUN HEAD:

The noun which acts as the head component of a *Noun Phrase.*

NOUN PHRASE:

Phrase whose head component is a noun.

OBJECTIVIZATION:

Process which makes a noun appear as object of a sentence.

OBLIQUE BASE:

The *Base Form* to which casal suffixes are added.

OBSTRUENT:

Speech sound produced without friction as opposed to *Spirant.*

ORAL:

Speech sound produced at the mouth cavity as opposed to nasal.

PARALANGUAGE:

Phenomenon which is communicative but which lies outside actual language and yet closely related to language. (See page 122).

PARTIAL COMPLEMENTATION:

State of a linguistic unit being in *Complementation* in some environments and in contrast in others.

PATH:

Case denoting 'through the way'.

PATIENT:

Case relation which denotes the affectant of an action, usually manifested by accusative marker.

PHONEME:

A fictious unit of speech sound which differentiates meaning; in contrast with other Phones; term employed to refer to a group of *Allophones*; also, conglomeration of a set of *Distinctive Features.*

PHONETIC ANALYSIS:

Analysis inquiring the characteristics of speech sounds.

PHONOLOGY:

Study of speech sounds both objectively and functionally.

PHONOTACTICS:

Study of the combinatory structure of Phones in larger units.

PIDGIN:

A mixed language resulting from the contact of two distinct languages; the structure of the lexicon and grammar will be drastically reduced in this; not a native language of anyone.

PLOSIVE:

Speech sound produced by complete closure, so called because release produces an effect of plosion.

POLYSYLLABIC:

Consisting of more than one syllable.

POST-NOMINAL:

A form which appears after a noun *morphologically* linked to the same.

POST-POSITION :

A form which appears after a major grammatical class (usually, a noun), syntactically linked with the same, and the whole behaving a composite unit.

PRAGMATIC :

Relating to the ways of life; pertaining to actual use.

PREDICATOR :

That which has the predicating function, usually, but not necessarily, a verb.

PRE-NOMINAL :

A form occuring before a noun.

PRESUPPOSITION :

The antecedent belief which is a pre-condition for the acceptability of an utterance.

PSEUDO-CASE :

A form which looks like a case but really not so.

PSEUDO-DATIVE :

Dative which does not have the function of usual datives.

REFLEX BEHAVIOUR :

Behaviour which is an automatic outcome of a stimulus 'Reflex' for short.

RELATIVIZATION :

Process by which a verb is transformed into a 'relative participle'.

SELECTION RESTRICTION :

Rules pertaining to semantically impossible combinations.

SEMANTIC MARKER :

A minimal feature of meaning; the meaning of a word, thus, is supposed to be a cluster of semantic markers, or, *Semantic Primitives*.

SEMANTIC PRIMITIVE:

(See *Semantic Marker.*)

SIBILANT:

The s-like sound.

SIGNAL:

Any phenomenon which is a natural denotation of something else.

SIMULTANEOUS ARTICULATION:

Two distinct articulations, done at same time to produce a unit of sound.

SOURCE:

Case function meaning 'movement from'.

SPIRANT:

(See *Fricative.*)

STATIVE (VERB):

Verb which does not denote an action and does not involve an *Agent*; as opposed to *Active Verb.*

STOP:

Speech sound produced by complete closure while articulating; *Plosive.*

SUPRASEGMENTAL:

Non–segmental phonic features like, length, pitch, stress, etc.

SURFACE SUBJECT:

Noun appearing as subject in the actual sentence, as opposed to *Deep Subject.*

SYMBOL:

Any phenomenon which arbitrarily denotes something else.

SYNCHRONIC:

Relating to a particular period; as opposed to *Diachronic.*

SYNTAGMATIC:

Pertaining to the combination of elements is a sentence.

SYNTAX:

The combination of linguistic units forming a sentence.

TELEGRAPHIC STRUCTURE:

Broken utterances of children, so named because of its similarity to telegraphic messages.

TERMINATIVE EXPLETIVE:

An *Empty Morph* appearing at the end of sentence.

TOPIC:

The component of an utterance which it speaks about, as opposed to *Comment*.

TOPICALIZATION:

Process by which some sentential component is made the *Topic* of utterance.

TRANSFORMATION:

Derivation of sentence from *Deep Structures*.

TRILL:

Speech sound produced by the vibration of the articulator.

VERBALIZATION:

Process by which some form is transformed into a verb.

VOCAL CHARACTERISTIC:

(See page 123.)

VOCALIZATION:

(See page 122.)

VOCAL QUALIFIER:

(See page 123.)

VOCAL SEGREGATE:

One type of *Minor Sentence* usually (but not quite correctly) referred to as *Interjections*.

VOICE QUALITY:

(See page 122.)

VOICE SET:

(See page 122.)

WORD CLASS:

Class of words based on *morphological* features.

AUTHOR INDEX

Abercrombie, 122
Abraham, 112, 114, 116-118
Achuthanunni, 42
Ananthanarayana, 91
Andronov, 22
Antony, 15, 23
Arbuthnot, 3
Asher, 44-46, 49, 51

Bach, 20, 40
Bennett, 70
Bever, 21
Bierwisch, 22
Bloomfield, 21
Bolinger, 20, 36

Caldwell, 10
Chafe, 52
Chandrasekhar, 91
Chomsky, 106
Chummar, 43
Crystal, 122
Curme, 21

Danks & Glucksberg, 21
Darden, 40
de Groot, 19
Drummond, 3

Ekman & Friesen, 124
Ezhuthachan, 42, 91

Ferguson, 39
Fillmore, 22, 64, 73, 84, 100, 106, 107, 114, 118
Francis, 34
Fries, 124
Frohnmeyer, 3, 9-11, 16, 23, 40

Givon, 22
Gonda, 124
Gruber, 70
Gundert, 2-6, 10-13, 15, 17, 23, 40, 43, 53, 63, 65, 80, 94, 110

Ikegami, 71

Jesperson, 20, 29

Kahn, 38
Kothandaraman, 51, 108
Kovunni Nedungadi, 3, 6
Kunjan Pillai, 85, 90
Kunnappally, 55, 99, 111
Kuroda, 107

Labov, 39
Lakoff, 40
Lakoff & Peters, 74
Lakoff & Ross, 107
Lazarus, 20
Lee, 106, 107
Lees, 34
Lyons, 40

Matthan, 2-6, 10-13, 15-17, 23, 30, 40, 43, 54, 63, 80, 94, 95, 110
Mc Cawley, 106, 107

Narayana Pillai, 42

Nilsen, 73

Ogden & Richards, 122

Peet, 3

Quine, 39
Quirk, et. al., 29

Rajaraja Varma, 2-8, 10, 11, 13, 15-17, 23, 54, 55, 63, 64, 77, 80, 90, 95, 96, 99, 101, 110
Ramaswamy Aiyyar, 4, 55, 63, 64, 96-98
Rensky, 122
Robins, 20, 123
Roose, 21

Schachter, 107
Schank & Tesler, 21
Schelsinger, 21
Seshagiri Prabhu, 3, 5, 6, 8-13, 15, 16, 101
Smith, 74
Soskin & Kauffman, 122
Spring, 3
Stratton, 73, 100
Sukumaran, 17

Trager, 122

Vasudeva Bhattathiri, 15
Velayudhan Pillai, 89, 91
Verma, 108, 110

Winter, 20

Yang, 107
Yngve, 128
Yotsukura, 21

Ziff, 21

SUBJECT INDEX

Ablative, 30
Accusative, 30, 87, 90
Acoustic phonetician, 8
Act, 124
Active, 39
Actor, 107, 108
Adessive, 87
Adjective (-ize-ival), 19-23, 25, 27, 29, 32, 35, 36, 39, 45, 59, 94, 97-99
Adverbial, 28, 30, 97, 98
Affective, 122
Affricate, 10
Agent (—ive), 74, 78, 106, 107, 109, 111, 112
Allograph, 15, 91
Allophone, 13
Alphabet, 1, 5, 7
Alternant, 41
Alveolar, 5, 8, 9, 15, 16
Ambari:ṣo:pa:khya:ṇam, 42, 91
Anaphoric pronoun, 118
Aṉuprayo:ga, 53
Aṉusva:ra, 5
Appositive, 34, 35, 74
Areal feature, 108
Article, 19
Articulatory mechanism, 7
Articulatory phonetics, 6, 8
Aspiration (—ted), 7, 8, 17
Aṣṭa:dhya:yi, 123
Attribute (—ive), 19-24, 28-31, 34-36, 46, 53, 54, 79-81, 93, 94, 97-99, 101, 115
Augument, 98
Auxilary, 20, 45, 49, 50, 52, 54, 57, 58, 62
Avyaya, 53, 54

Back vowel, 5, 51
Base form, 84
Basic vowel, 13
Bha:ṣa:kauṭali:yam, 42, 85, 88
Bound form, 55
Brahma:ṇḍhapura:ṇam, 91
Breath release, 7, 8

Category function, 62, 109
Causal, 23, 30, 90
Centamiḻ, 89
Centralization, 41
Cerebral, 12, 51
Child language, 39
Clitic, 43, 53, 58
Closing (—ed), 8, 13
Comment, 47, 48, 52, 113
Comparative, 86
Complimentation (—ary, rity), 15-17, 72, 114, 119
Conjunction (—ive), 54, 74
Contact, 7, 8
Content word, 54
Copula, 37-43, 45, 48-50, 95

Copulative sentence, 37
Creole, 39

Dative, 30, 63-65, 86, 90, 108, 110, 112-118
Declarative, 42
Deep case, 70, 73
Deep structure, 39, 40, 106
Defective verb, 54
Deictic, 31
Demonstrative, 19, 23, 24, 31, 35
Dental, 15, 16, 51
Descriptive, 21, 23, 29, 35, 46
Determiner, 21
Diachronic, 3, 125
Dialect, 6, 11, 14, 16, 41, 42, 50, 51, 62, 64, 85, 87, 90, 117
Dipthong, 11
Directive (—ion), 30, 63-65, 69, 70, 72, 85, 98
Distinctive feature, 15
Distribution, 9
Double articulation, 7
Dravidian, 8, 11, 12, 22, 37, 38, 41, 45, 50, 63, 79, 84, 90, 108
Dummy verb, 40
Du:tava:kyam, 91
Dyo:taka, 54

Elliptical, 52
Embedded construction, 106
Emotive, 110, 126
Emphasizing function, 48
Emphatic, 44-47, 52, 98
Empty morph, 26, 86, 92
Entailment rule, 22
Equative, 29, 44-46
Existential sentence, 48
Existential verb (meaning), 33, 46, 48, 101, 102
Experience (—er), 115, 116
Experiential, 44-46
External, 8

Flap, 8, 16
Focus (—sing), 48, 52, 113
Form class, 24
Fricative, 10
Fricativization, 8, 10
Front vowel, 5
Function word, 39, 54, 55, 79
Functor, 39

Gati, 53, 55
Generative grammar, 40
Genitive, 29, 30, 77, 78, 80, 81, 87, 115, 126
Glottis, 7
Goal, 114, 115
Graphemic, 15
Gutteral sound, 7

Half-contact, 7, 8
Half-u, 12
Half vowel, 12
Head noun, 21, 24, 26, 27

Idiolect, 16
Imperative, 78, 106
Indeclinable, 53, 54
Indicative, 30, 31
Indo-Aryan, 38
Indo-European, 38, 108
Inessive, 87
Infinitive, 50, 98, 118
Inflection (—al), 20, 63, 65, 86, 87

Information theory, 113
Inherent, 22
Instrument (—al), 30, 73, 74, 86, 109
Intensifier, 36
Interjection (—al), 54, 79, 98, 123, 124, 126
Internal, 8
Interrogative, 28, 49, 54, 98
Intervocalic, 10
I:ṟṟasai, 97, 98

Ka:raka, 29, 77, 78, 80, 84, 85, 90, 111
Ke:raḷabha:ṣa, 89
Ke:raḷakaumudi, 3
Ke:raḷapa:ṇini:yam, 2-4, 101
Kinesics, 122

Labial, 14
Lateral, 7
Laxness, 9
Li:la:tilakam, 2, 4, 6, 83-89
Limiting, 21
Linguistic ontogeny, 21
Linguistic phylogeny, 88
Lip rounding, 7
Liquid, 12
Literary stylistics, 2
Loan word, 12
Location (—al), 44-46, 69, 72, 102, 114, 116
Locative, 30, 32, 52, 64, 65, 69, 74, 87, 90, 94-97, 103, 116

Malaya:ḷabha:ṣa:vya:karaṇam, 43
Malaya:ḷmayuṭe vya:karaṇam, 2, 43
Maṇiprava:ḷa, 2, 87
Medial, 5, 7, 8, 10, 14
Mediation, 72
Minor sentence, 79
Monosyllabic, 10, 41
Morphology (—ical), 37, 38, 54, 57, 79, 83
Morphotactics, 17
Motion verb, 68
Movement verb, 70-72

Naḷo:pa:khya:ṉam, 42, 91
Naṉṉu:l, 5, 90, 98
Narrative, 42
Narrative tense, 20
Nasal, 7, 8, 16
Nasal release, 8
Neutralization, 40
Nipa:ta, 53, 54
Nominal compound, 34, 94
Nominalize (—ation), 25-27, 50, 52, 81, 99
Nominative, 52, 84, 90, 94, 108, 110, 111, 113, 114, 118
Non-contact, 7, 8
Non-restricted, 59, 60, 62
Non-stative, 20
Non-syllabic, 15-17
Noun-head, 34
Noun-phrase, 24, 27, 34, 41, 46, 105, 106, 108-110, 112, 113, 116, 117
Numeral, 23, 24, 35, 36
Numerative, 21

Object (—ive), 30, 32, 86, 106, 107, 109, 110
Objectivization, 73

Oblique base, 64
Obstruent, 7
Open (—ing), 8, 13
Oral, 7

Palatal, 13, 14
Paralanguage (—linguistic), 122, 123
Parenthesis, 79
Partial complementation, 16
Participal, 43
Particle, 53, 54, 58, 74, 95-98, 103, 123, 124
Path, 30, 69, 70, 72-75
Patient, 74
Pa:tiri malaya:ḷam, 50
Phone, 9
Phoneme (—ic), 5, 9, 13, 15, 17
Phonetic analysis, 6
Phonetic quality, 9
Phonology, 17, 37, 38
Phonotactics, 17
Phrasal verb, 51
Pidgin, 39, 90
Plosive, 9, 10
Polarity, 22
Polysyllabic, 11
Possessive (—ion, —or), 90, 115, 118
Post-nominal, 24, 34, 35
Post-position (—al), 34, 53, 55-62, 85, 97, 99, 100
Pragmatic, 21, 29, 32
Prathama, 84
Pre-adjunct, 21
Predicate (—or, —ive, —ion), 39, 40, 43, 45, 47, 48, 52, 70, 71, 100, 103, 105, 106
Pre-nominal, 20-22, 24, 27, 35
Pre-position, 55, 123, 124
Pre-supposition, 48
Progressive, 49
Pro-nominal, 23, 25, 26, 28, 40, 99
Proto-Dravidian, 38, 51
Pseudo-case, 95, 96, 99, 100
Pseudo-dative, 112-114

Reconstruction, 37
Reduplication, 35, 36
Reflex, 124
Relational concept, 22
Relative participle, 19, 23, 29, 31-33, 95
Relativization (—ize), 29, 52
Restricted, 59, 60, 62
Restrictive, 98
Rounded, 12, 13

Sambandha, 29
Samprada:n̲a, 80
Sandhi, 14
Ṣaṣṭhi, 80, 87
Selection restriction, 106
Semantic marker, 22
Semantic primitive, 22
Sibilant, 5, 7
Signal, 124
Simultaneous articulation, 7
Slight contact, 7, 8
Sociative, 30, 90, 91
Sonant, 10, 11, 14, 17
Source, 69, 71-73
Spatial expression, 69, 71, 72
Specifying, 31
Spirant, 7

Standard language, 51
State (—ive), 20, 39, 40, 110
Stop, 7, 8, 10
Subject, 30, 32, 40, 47, 52, 105-113, 115, 116, 118, 119
Substantive, 20
Suprasegmental, 52
Surd, 10
Symbol, 124
Synchronic, 3, 4
Syntagmatic, 19
Syntax, 38
Synthesive, 20

Tatsama, 87
Telegraphic structure, 39
Terminative expletive, 97
Terminology, 1, 2
Theme, 113
Tolka:ppiam, 77, 84, 85, 90, 97
Tongue height, 7
Tongue movement, 7
Tongue position, 7
Topic, 30, 47, 52, 88, 107, 108. 113
Topicalization, 107
Transformation (—al), 20, 40, 46-48, 50, 51, 87, 101, 103, 106, 109
Trill, 5-9, 16

U:ṉakriya, 54
Unrounded, 13, 41

Va:caka, 54
Varga, 5
Varttama:ṉapustakam, 42
Velar, 13
Verbalization (—er), 42, 51
Verticality, 22
Vibhakti, 80, 84, 87
Visarga, 5
Vocal characteristics, 123
Vocalic sound, 5
Vocalization, 122, 124
Vocal qualifier, 123
Vocal segregate, 79, 121, 123, 125-128
Vocative, 29, 77-79, 84, 87, 90, 98, 126
Voiced, 7-10
Voiced stop, 9, 10
Voice dynamics, 122
Voiceless, 7-10
Voiceless stop, 9
Voice quality, 122
Voice set, 122
Voicing, 8
Vya:karaṇamitram, 3, 101
Vya:kṣe:paka, 55

Word class, 19, 55, 59

ERRATA

Page	Line	For	Read
7	23	omission	emission
45	19	*mana:hariya:ṇə*	*mano:hariya:ṇə*
63	10	Matthen	Matthan
70	5	vary	varies
84	19	individnal	individual
84	31	even	when
139	25	Ceole	Creole
141	15	QUATIVE	EQUATIVE